

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1399990

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ADAM J. LOEPPERT, D. D.



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

A. J. Boulter

Chinag

BX
1396
LB

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

By
ADAM J. LOEPPERT, D. D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL, D. D.



CINCINNATI: JENNINGS AND GRAHAM
NEW YORK: EATON AND MAINS

COPYRIGHT, 1912, BY
JENNINGS AND GRAHAM

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	A PERSONAL WORD, - - - - -	5
	INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	9
I.	MODERNISM, - - - - -	15
II.	ITALY, - - - - -	36
III.	FRANCE, - - - - -	65
IV.	GERMANY, - - - - -	88
V.	ENGLAND, - - - - -	108
VI.	AUSTRIA, - - - - -	138
VII.	SPAIN, - - - - -	157
VIII.	STRUGGLE OF PIUS X, - - - - -	178
IX.	THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH, - -	226
X.	THE UNITED STATES, - - - - -	265

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

A PERSONAL WORD

SOME three years ago the study on "Religious Life in Europe," of which a number of articles have appeared since regularly in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, first drew my attention to the present phase of difficulty within the Papal Church. Later Dr. James M. Buckley, editor of the *Christian Advocate* (New York), published an extensive review written by the author on Dr. Josef Schnitzer's important work, "Did Christ Found the Papacy?" ("Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet?") The extreme interest of the subject, then shown by many notable students in the comment upon the review, cast its spell upon me from the very first; and I resolved to make it a matter of more detailed study. Consequently my purpose has been to describe the actual status of the conflict in various countries between the authority of the Vatican in matters of faith and modern scholarship, sometimes of

A PERSONAL WORD

the extreme type. This purpose has, however, been modified by a deepening conviction that there is still considerable work to be done, and that it is not yet time to write the history of the decline and fall of Modernism. Assuredly no Roman pontiff has ever proclaimed, from the chair that is called of Saint Peter, a crusade that is more relentless and persistent than the one which Pope Pius X has inaugurated against priests, professors, and scholars within the Roman Catholic Church who refuse to subscribe to all Papal assumptions in the light of modern scholarship. Modernism is fundamentally a great question of spiritual liberty with a tragic element of suffering. It aims at the restatement of the creed, a change in the external polity, as well as a regeneration of the inner spirit of the Mother Church of Christendom.

Grateful acknowledgment is hereby made to Bishop William Fraser McDowell, D. D., for writing the introduction; to Rev. E. C. E. Dorion, D. D., associate editor of *Zion's Herald*, for correcting the manuscript; to Rev. C. M. Stuart, D. D., president of

A PERSONAL WORD

Garrett Biblical Institute, for many helpful hints and suggestions; to Pastor Johannes Kübel, D. D., of Frankfurt am Main, Germany, pastor of the Lutheran Church and author of "Die Geschichte des Katholischen Modernismus," who so cheerfully granted to the author the permission to make use of his valuable book. Other friends have made the author their debtor, but their names, as in case of so many of the world's most helpful spirits, do not appear in the records.

I commit this little volume to the reading public with a firm conviction that, if it fails to create interest, the writer, not the subject, must be held to blame.

ADAM J. LOEPPERT.

Elgin, Ill., October 25, 1911.

INTRODUCTION

MODERNISM can neither be defined in a sentence nor characterized by an adjective or an epithet. An attitude, a sentiment, a principle, a method, a movement—it is all of these. It is one of those things of which we say they are “in the air.” Their enemies declare that the Modernists are “up in the air,” but Modernism can not be so easily disposed of. Possibly the Roman Catholic Church is just now experiencing the most acute experience of Modernism, but it is not wholly a movement within that Church. Nor is it simply a sensation on the surface of the Church, caused by a few men making a noise. The movement in Romanism and out of it goes very deep, no matter by what name it is called. Its roots strike far back in history and are intertwined with the forces that we call the Reformation and the Renaissance. The really potential and significant movements in theology, or science, or poli-

INTRODUCTION

ties, or life are not the creatures of a single day. They have their roots in the centuries. This Modernist movement could not be escaped, even if it were desirable to escape it, after Protestantism made its place in the world. Sooner or later these issues were bound to emerge in all Churches, and in all regions of life and thought. This is the logic, the resistless logic of a genuinely living thing.

And such movements always give pain and make disturbances. The established order does not readily adjust itself to expanding conditions. And life keeps on expanding. I saw a wall not long ago which had been quite ruined by a growing tree. The wall had been ruined and had at the same time kept the tree from having a fair chance for a normal growth. Maybe the tree should have been destroyed, root and branch, in order to save the wall. Maybe the wall should have been torn down in order to give a real tree a real chance for growth. Evidently there was a bad adjustment, equally bad for both. The tree was full of life and just pushed ahead. The wall would not yield.

INTRODUCTION

Both suffered. Growth is likely to be rather regardless. Walls have a tendency to be stubborn. Under those circumstances mischief is almost certain to follow.

Now here is this movement of Modernism with its energy, its determination, its vitality, its deepest roots, its expansion. And here is a stone wall, old and well established, not recognizing this growing tree as having any right to grow where growth will affect the wall. And in Romanism the tree grows. It has a program. And the pope issues an encyclical against it; a long and elaborate document reminding students of history of mediæval days. And the Modernists ask troublesome questions like this: "Is there in the Catholic Church a power of conquest, or simply a conservative instinct? Does she still hide in the secret complexities of her wonderful organization capacities for winning adherents, or is her vitality threatened by the germs of a speedy decay? Is her mission henceforth to be limited to a suspicious vigilance over the rude and simple faith of her rapidly-dwindling followers, or will she rouse herself to the reacquisition of

INTRODUCTION

that social influence which she has lost through her long years of listless self-isolation?" And Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church declares: "The Church and society can never meet on the basis of those ideas which prevailed at the Council of Trent, nor can they converse together in mediæval language. How many days have dawned since the time of Innocent III! How many events have ripened since Paul III!"

And the pope answers, ordering that "all young professors suspected of Modernism are to be driven from their chairs in the seminaries; that infected books are to be condemned indiscriminately; that a committee of safe censors for the revision of books is to be established in every diocese; that meetings of modernizing priests or laymen are to be forbidden; that young ecclesiastics are to be prevented from studying the general movements of contemporary thought; that every diocese is to have a vigilance committee to discover and eliminate Modernists; and that all bishops are to become inquisitors-general against every phase of Modernism in their dioceses."

INTRODUCTION

And the tree and the wall have clearly joined issue!

And all this is vastly larger than simply a Roman Catholic question. Protestantism has no pleasure in the blunders or disasters of Romanism. But Protestantism may well observe the movements in Romanism and their treatment by Romanism lest Protestantism may blunder and meet disaster in the day of trial.

This volume is an attempt to set forth the principles and meaning of Modernism and its relation to the Roman Catholic Church. But it is of significance and value for Protestantism as well. "If your neighbor's thatch is on fire, look out for your own roof." As a careful, faithful study of a most interesting current problem in Church life and religious thought this volume is commended to careful readers and students of the times.

WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL.

Chicago, October 24, 1911.

Modernism and the Vatican

I

MODERNISM

CHRISTIANITY offers to each age, as it comes, its own special problem. That for our own day seems more fundamental than that of any which has preceded it in recent history, and that chiefly because there has never been a time when so penetrating a scrutiny has been turned upon religious belief as now. This cultivated insight, directed upon the Christian origins, has now opened an entirely new set of difficulties for orthodoxy. The inner conflict is by no means confined to the Protestant wing of the Christian Church, where the present crisis overshadows any battle of former centuries, excepting the Lutheran Reformation; nor is it satisfied with gaining a strategic point about one singular dogma or one article of the Christian faith, as each have been understood and declared by the Church, both Catholic and Protestant.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

It may be admitted with Rothe that the distinctive glory of the Christian religion is, that of all institutions it is the most capable of change, for we recognize its adaptability to all generations; yet this does not apply to the presentation of it, as offered by the Church of Rome, bound as that Church is to a dead past by precedent, by her special genius, and by the persistent voice of a supreme and infallible papacy. But Rome has felt in its Modernist movement that struggle which confronts serious thinkers of all Churches. Whatever the ultimate destiny and results may be—and it is difficult to forecast them—this most important life and thought tendency, that has appeared since the Reformation, must in all seriousness be reckoned with.

The present phase of the liberalizing movement in the Church of Rome received the name “Modernism,” and this phase may be described as the shape which religion takes in the mind of the modern as distinct from the mediæval man. In this large sense it is found in all the Churches. The pious Moravians in Bohemia must meet the conflict as well as the Baptists or Methodists in the

MODERNISM

United States, while the State Church of Germany or Norway can not escape the ordeal where fierce battles are as yet raging. No communion has escaped the strain which attends the inevitable friction between the old and the new.

This strain is exceptionally severe, however, in the Church of Rome, caused by the stereotyping and accentuation of the ecclesiastical element. The lateness of this development makes the situation more difficult, for this is not the sixteenth century of the Lutheran Reformation, but the twentieth of the Reformation of Latin Christendom. The demands of such a movement can not be entirely rejected. For the Modernist of to-day, as we shall later see, is not, as claimed by some official Catholic papers, a monist pure and simple. He acknowledges and reveres the sanctity which appears so often in the Church.

Protestantism has watched with close attention and sincere sympathy developments in the Roman camp. For Protestantism is affected to some extent by the great changes within the Papal Church as well

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

as is Catholicism itself. This is true especially in Germany and the United States of America, where the denominations live so closely together and where a constant, quiet, but none the less perceptible influence is exerted by the one upon the other. Consequently it would be mere deception to believe that only Protestantism must play an active part in this movement. A crisis wherein Roman Catholicism would lose some of its spiritual or moral power would certainly not be beneficial to the Protestant Church, while, on the other hand, a great advance movement within the papal camp would without doubt benefit Protestantism. The problem of harmonizing the beliefs of Protestant orthodoxy with the science of modern times has been keenly felt within the Church for over a hundred years. That the same problem should now be met within the Roman Church is not to be wondered at. It greatly stirs and even angers the Holy Father and his advisers at the Vatican, but it is one more proof that this question can not be rejected in modern life. How will Romanism meet the situation? Protestantism, through

MODERNISM

many painful experiences, is familiar with the difficulty. The opposing factions are facing each other to-day with the same determination that characterized the struggle fifty years ago. Will the Catholic Church solve these problems of uniting the old and the new within her own borders with less difficulty than does Protestantism? Will modern thinking exert an influence upon her system without causing serious friction or, in some quarters, even disruption? Can she reform herself with regard to papal assumptions?

How is it that this problem forces itself so impetuously at present upon the Catholic Church? She has always kept step with progress and civilization, according to her idea, until these last great changes appeared. She absorbed Hellenistic and Roman culture soon after her establishment in Rome; in the Middle Ages we find her equally able to meet scholasticism; during the period of the Renaissance valuable elements were not rejected by Catholic standard-bearers, and in the eighteenth century even we find her sons yielding to the power of enlightenment. The

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

spirit of modern movements began, undoubtedly, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but it was met with peculiar energy and oppression. Rome rejected the ideas of enlightenment by her return in systematic theology to the Middle Ages. As the mind of our time is positive rather than metaphysical, it turns instinctively to the actual, testing theory and formula by fact. For the Catholic theologian, however, facts and history are dangerous ground. In the last century a protest against the stereotyping and professionalizing of religion was not wanting within the Church of Rome, considering such names as Lamennais, Montalembert, Döllinger, and recently Prince Max, the latter in his sincere attempt to unite the Eastern and Western branches of the Catholic Church. They and others have endeavored to stem the rising tide of clericalism and keep religion in touch with life. Although some of these attempts failed in their immediate purpose, yet they were not in vain; political, historical, and theological liberalism have poured their waters into the flood of Modernism. And therefore not a particular dogma or in-

MODERNISM

stitution is in question, but the whole fabric of Roman Catholicism. Nothing, then, is more unjust or untrue than to brand in consequence the Modernists as iconoclasts, who recklessly and cruelly wreck the faith of the simple.

While dealing with the freer tendencies in Catholicism, as seen in the works of such men as Schell, Kraus, Ehrhard, Schnitzer, and Koch, it can not be overlooked that Modernism proper is a movement of the Latin mind. Its home is in Latin countries—France and Italy especially; we also find that at the head of every department of its activity there stands a man of the Latin race. In the atmosphere and under the peculiar conditions as found in Italy, France, and Spain Modernism has been bred. Professor Giovanni Luzzi says: “All is not dead in Roman Catholicism; the immense agglomeration of additions and superstitions has not yet quenched in its bosom the spark of Christ’s Christianity. As a protest against the mediæval ecclesiasticism of the Vatican, Modernism has raised its head. Everywhere it has permeated: seminaries, monasteries,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

town and country parishes through reviews, translations of foreign works, newspapers, pamphlets, secret circulars; everywhere it has carried the breath of new hopes, of new ideas, of new aspirations.” This professor of Florence knows many cells in different convents; he has entered the homes of many priests in the country and in town; he knows well what the young think in more than one seminary; and therefore he is in a position to state authoritatively that of a hundred clerics, from forty years of age upwards in Italy, not less than sixty kept most jealously in their private desks the best products of Modernist literature.

Modernism is a complex phenomenon. Its modernity is undoubtedly good, while exaggeration, the other side of it, has often had bad tendencies and evil influences. The one word, Modernism, which describes both modernity and exaggeration, is most unfortunate, inasmuch as it only suggests reproof. The Jesuit Fathers of Rome invented this term. Pius X got it from them and has adopted it in his official documents, and with his free hand he uses it to condemn all the

MODERNISM

new disturbers of the Church. Although Modernism is not a system to be defined by a formula, it is, however, a synthesis of several new movements in theological and ecclesiastical thought in the Roman Church. It will not miss its mark if it knows how to keep itself on the granitic basis of Christ's Christianity; if it is able to organize itself; if it succeeds in rousing in the laity an interest in their things. In this connection it might be stated that Modernism should try to aim at a more rational conception of dogma, and should consequently revise the formulas of its catechism in some respects. While it must insist on the necessity of a clear and sharp distinction between religion and theology, it must also remember not to allow itself to be carried away by the flood of hypercriticism, lest it be hurled into the sea of unbelief and be lost.

“Modernism,” a term fitly used in contrast with the term “Mediævalism” in its meaning, spirit, and method, is by no means to be applied exclusively to the Roman Catholic liberals whom the pope has condemned. It stands for progressive, well-marked, and

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

often destructive tendencies in all the religious communions. Every denomination of religious people has an advance guard, representing in a general way the new discoveries and fresh interpretations and mobile elements of the truth which is common to the whole body. Over against these will be found a conservative school, solicitous for the original foundations and referring itself to established documents. In this far-reaching clash between the old and the new in the Papal Church the thoughtful man will be impressed by the presence of both these classes as precisely the fittest provision for preserving the sane and divine balance of progress. We shall meet these men in the movements in Italy, France, and in German Reform Catholicism, as a conservative party to correct the excesses and extremes of the other side.

The year 1907 was undoubtedly the most important year in the history of religious Catholicism since the Vatican Council, excepting probably the latest developments resulting from the issuance of the new circulants against the Modernists. Clash upon

MODERNISM

clash followed; each excelling the other in bitterness and rigor. As a prelude Pope Pius X complained, April 17th of that year, of the terrible heresies which were then evident in the Roman Church, and which he thought would destroy Christianity. The first act, properly speaking, occurred on the fourth of July, 1907, when the pope signed the "Decree of the Holy Officium Lamentabili," the Syllabus, a catalogue of sixty-five theological heresies, which the Congregation of the Inquisition had prepared at the Holy Father's request and command. Then, on September 8, 1907, the supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church issued a pronunciamento which registers an important epoch in the history of modern thought. The effects of this encyclical will long be felt throughout Christendom, and the deliverance of it is bound to become historic. This pronunciamento deals with the greatest themes of morality and religion; it also fearlessly grapples with the profoundest problems of philosophy and science, of civil government and social economy; it further held a close and controlling grip upon the indi-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

vidual conduct and private lives of the faithful, and so has in it the elements of a genuine inquisition, as it speaks with a tone of an authority which deems it unnecessary to state the grounds of its absolute and universal sway.

What were the causes which called forth this “*Pascendi dominici gregis*” of September 8, 1907? Roman Catholicism has often been embarrassed by serious differences and dissensions within. No intelligent reader of history will doubt this. Ultramontanism and Gallicanism, Jesuitism and Jansenism, the old Covenanter and the higher critic, have hated each other with a cordial hatred that has not been too much softened by their common allegiance to the throne of St. Peter. Presently these differences are rather sharpened than delayed. This encyclical in its tone and contents makes plain the open secret that the pope to-day is quite as much the head of a faction, the tool of the Curia, as he is the spiritual head of the entire body of Roman Catholics.

The marvelous changes in the world's theories and thinking during the last century

MODERNISM

have unchained a spirit of inquiry, and the old papal authority with its assumptions has been fearlessly challenged. While not very many of the leaders of modern scientific thought have been devout Roman Catholics, yet there have been some; but they have had to struggle against heavy odds. According to the encyclical the Modernist has really seven functions. He is, as a philosopher, in the papal judgment an Agnostic; and now follows a severe castigation of Agnosticism. As a believer the Modernist believes too much rather than too little. The Modernist theologian aims at the conciliation of faith and science, always, however, saving the primacy of science over faith. As a historian the Modernist harks back to his own philosophy and, accordingly, knows nothing except phenomena; and so the things that are out of sight, such as God and the divine side of external religion, are handed over by the historian to the sacred domain of faith. Hence the modern talk about the Christ of history being one thing and the Christ of faith quite another. Pope Pius X is here striking at no imaginary evil, and we are

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

bound to consent that the blow is not misplaced. The Modernist is further taken to task as a higher critic for his adventures into the criticism of the Holy Scriptures.

As an apologist two shields of defense are open to the Modernist, the objective and the subjective. Lastly, the Modernist is charged with trying to overthrow nearly everything which the Church thinks is worth while to maintain. According to this papal letter the Modernist would change the present order of things in philosophy, in history, in dogma, in worship, and in episcopal administration and authority. And therefore, as a reformer, he is a sort of an ecclesiastical anarchist in the Church of Rome.

This first great letter against the Modernists in its second part discusses the causes of Modernism, giving simply two; namely, curiosity and pride, while the intellectual cause is ignorance. It further prescribes remedies against Modernism, of which the first is exceedingly significant; it is the study of the scholastic philosophy on which "the theological edifice is to be solidly raised." The second remedy is a practical

MODERNISM

but drastic, and for Roman Catholicism characteristic, application. The following injunction gives it, “Anybody who in any way is found to be imbued with Modernism is to be excluded without compunction from the offices of directors and professors in seminaries and Catholic universities.” Then follows the episcopal vigilance over publications; the censorship which is so rigid and searching that many in reading it are carried back into the atmosphere of mediæval times. Congresses and public gatherings, where Modernists might ventilate and defend their views, are to be tolerated only on very rare occasions, and when permitted, no mention is to be made of Modernism. Vigilance committees are to be set at work in every diocese, bound to secrecy in their deliberations and decisions, whose business it shall be to watch for and by all prudent, prompt, and efficacious measures to nip in the bud all the poisonous weed of Modernism. Should this all fail, finally, there are to be triennial returns from all bishops, furnishing the Vatican with a diligent and sworn report upon the whole situation, especially on the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

doctrines that find currency among the clergy.

This is simply a brief outline of the encyclical of September 8, 1907, covering some forty-eight pages. On November 18th of the same year Pope Pius X confirmed the Syllabus of July 4th, also the encyclical of September 8th, "by virtue of His Apostolic Authority," and consequently threatened any possible offenders with excommunication. As a postlude to this, on December 16, 1907, he expressed his special thanks and appreciation to the bishops who so loyally and faithfully supported him in the fierce battle against the Modernists, and yet "in spite of all the efforts their mischievous malice did not disappear; may God enlighten the erring!" Germany had a rather amusing incident when a committee of laymen of Münster waited upon the Vatican authorities with the request to have the stringent precepts of the Index at Rome changed; also the struggle about Herman Schell's grave, and the inexplicable letter in which Pope Pius X congratulated Professor Ernest Commer on the pamphlet the latter had written concerning

MODERNISM

Schell, and wherein the Holy Father declared to the twenty German theological professors, to the Bishop of Regensburg, and to the Archbishop of Bamberg, that they either understood nothing of Catholic truth or else were opposed to the authority of the Holy See.

Modernism has one great weakness which lies in the fact that it has no great unifying and organizing principle; it has not yet crystallized into a definite, positive movement. An attentive observer, however, can not down the conviction that the Vatican is playing a losing game, should the pope and his advisers insist on the thus far stringent but unprofitable measures. In Italy the Quirinal stands over against the Vatican, and the pope's weak protest at being bereft of his temporal power goes unheeded, if not unheard. France has long been a land of allegiance to Rome, but to-day, with a dismantled establishment, with a divided clergy, and with a distracted laity, France has plainly been too much for the narrow statesmanship and lame diplomacy of Pope Pius X. Spain refuses to be governed by Rome in the future,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

and openly protests against the mediæval methods of the Vatican, while the reign of monks and nuns in Portugal has not bettered this land, a land wherein Protestant missionaries never worked. The de-Romanizing movement in Austria is steadily going on until it has reached such enormous dimensions in Eastern Russia and in Poland that it is estimated that the Mariarites (the new name of the dissenters) number from four to six hundred thousand followers. And it is feared that the Vatican knows nothing of the seriousness and depth of feeling in Germany, and that the Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, and others, in whose hands rest the affairs of the Curia, are ill able to appreciate the struggles and the pain, inseparable from the searchings after truth, which have been characteristic of Germany since the days of the Reformation.

The spirit of the Vatican in the struggle with Modernism is autocratic, while in contrast the spirit of the age is democratic; consequently the conflict is drawing nearer. Therefore the Modernist, as a reformer,

MODERNISM

urges that the spirit of the Church must be brought into harmony with the public conscience, which is wholly for democracy; he also demands that a share in ecclesiastical government should be given to the lower ranks of the clergy and even to the laity. The common man, who has drunk too freely and deeply from the blessed fountain of freedom, demands to be led in future years and refuses to be driven. This important fact should be perceived by the Vatican authorities.

Pope Pius X understands by Modernism really the "Essence of all Heresies," meaning the introduction of the historic-critical Bible science and the after-scholastic philosophy into Catholicism. This Modernism, however, had its predecessors; Reform Catholicism, Ideal Catholicism, Americanism belong here. Their object has been to bring Catholicism into harmony with the spirit of the newer time and the modern world. These movements will receive proper attention in later chapters.

Protestantism has by no means created

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

this condition, although Protestants have been branded by the pope as "Modernists, one degree less removed." But Protestantism has recognized these new conditions and has endeavored to make the ideals of the newer time subservient to the attainment of a higher efficiency. Catholicism stood more closely in harmony with the modern spirit one hundred years ago than it does to-day. This is the opinion of many scholars. The theological faculty at the University of Würzburg at that time consisted of both Protestant and Catholic professors; while the more gifted Catholic students in the Klerikalseminar in 1804 were obliged to listen to Protestant lectures in the university, the Protestant Professor Paulus outlining the plan of studies. The enlightenment of the eighteenth century had also influenced Catholic theology.

Modern demands—such as freedom of conscience, new philosophy, critical Bible study—have, here quietly and there impetuously, knocked at the door of Rome and asked for admission. They tried in vain. Whence came the men who wanted to pour new wine

MODERNISM

into old bottles? What have they accomplished? What will they do in the future; what will they experience and suffer in their battle for truth and freedom of conscience, in their battle for God?

II

ITALY

ABOUT the middle of the nineteenth century we find two theologians in Italy who deeply felt the contrast between the spirit of present-day Roman Catholicism and that of the modern age: Antonio Rosmini and Vincenzo Gioberti. Both had been thoroughly educated in philosophy, were enthusiastic in religion, full of idealism and of the desire of achieving their definite aim. The faithfulness of Count Rosmini in matters of religion and his devotion to the Church were never questioned; he was unconditionally devoted to Pope Pius IX, and he earnestly desired through his philosophical studies to serve his Church. He would bring Catholicism into harmony with a philosophy that would furnish to theology weapons against infidelity. Rosmini leaned toward the ideas of Descartes, consequently his position even unwittingly was bound to injure the dogma of tra-

ITALY

dition. The Church scented danger, and in 1849 placed his writings on the Index; forty of his maxims were later censured in 1887.

Vincenzo Gioberti, priest, philosopher, and politician, was exiled for many years from Italy on account of his theological liberalism, although he condemned the philosophical system of Rosmini as pagan and Protestant, claiming that his own theology contained the only Catholicism and orthodoxy. Gioberti's success is found in his political career, fighting for the liberty and unity of Italy in such a manner that the leadership in the future state of Italy should be placed into the hands of the pope. He recognized the critical conditions of Italian Roman Catholicism, clearly and unsparingly branding the Jesuitical danger in his "Prolegomeni" (1845); his main achievement, however, is in his political work "Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani" (1843).

Besides Rosmini and Gioberti, the two theologians, Italy's greatest statesman is entitled to a place among the forerunners of the present Modernist movement. Count Cavour, as pioneer, prepared the way for

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the final union of Italy in the expulsion of a political papacy; yet he thought of a peaceful adjustment between the pope and united Italy with his slogan, "A Free Church in a Free State," thus reconciling the State and the Church, modern culture and Catholicism.

The Church has reaped nothing from the seed sown by these three men. The revival of scholasticism and the Vatican Council refused admittance to any non-Thomastic philosophy or theology. When the papal States were annexed to the Kingdom of Italy, the religious and political demands of that country were then brought into an irreconcilable contrast, and between the Church and the State, as between the Church and modern culture, the most embittered enmity followed. Repeatedly the State had made overtures for peace, yet they were harshly rejected by the Church, and the Catholics of Italy were forbidden to take any part whatever in the political life. Consequently many stood in open opposition to the Church and were compelled to desist from any active part in ecclesiastical functions. This irreconcilable spirit found further expression in the fact that in

ITALY

1873 the theological faculties were divorced from State universities.

Dr. Albert Ehrhard, the celebrated German Catholic theologian, says: "Catholic theology exerts no definite influence upon the national intellectual life of Italy, but has lost its public position in the intellectual life almost entirely; it has degenerated into a special, if not secret, science of the clerics. It has taken refuge in the seminaries for priests, and there suffers a meager existence. Italy has three hundred such seminaries; among these are hardly forty or fifty, according to men of knowledge, where the instructors deserve the name 'Professor.' In addition this comparatively little country, where the intelligent inhabitants keep at a distance from the Church, must furnish two hundred and eighty bishops; this demand is so large that it is impossible to supply it with only able and excellent personalities." Therefore it must be possible that the influence of such men as Mariano, professor in Church History at the University of Naples; Chiappelli, professor in History of Philosophy at Naples; and Labanca, professor of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Church History at the University of Rome, men who love their Church, is not heeded by such clerics as Ehrhard describes.

It was the French school of hypercritical Modernists, headed by Abbé Alfred Loisy, with its newer theological tendencies that carried the flame into Italy. Several Italian clerics had read Loisy's writings; the questions he propounded were their own questions; here they found the answer. And when they laid the French books aside, it was only for the purpose of influencing their Italian brothers with the new theology, one corresponding to the French developments. They would deal on scientific lines with the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the atmosphere of the Primitive Church. In later years, however, they have given themselves over to the apologetic-philosophic field. This new trend in Biblical science, though rather young, as it did not make its appearance until about 1895, numbers not many names, yet behind every name there stand not only a strong character but an army of loyal pupils and the enlisting power of truth.

The first Modernist cleric of Italy was

ITALY

Salvatore Minocchi, professor of Hebrew at the Reale Istituto Superiore of Florence, who was familiar with the Old and New Testament texts and the history of the Christian Church. In 1896 he founded the "Rivista Bibliografica," to teach the clerics the new publications and the new developments in Biblical science; from 1901 to 1907, in conjunction with like-minded friends, he edited *Studi Religiosi*, which was later suppressed. He translated Genesis, Isaiah, the Psalms, and the Gospels into the Italian language. How keenly he could discern the developments in French, Italian, and German theology is shown in an article appearing in the last issue of *Studi Religiosi* on "The Present Crisis in German Catholicism." Minocchi admits the superiority of the German Catholic clerics over the French and Italian in their general education, but proves otherwise that the German Catholic theological science does not measure up to the French and the Italian. The astonishing and abashed retrograde movement is explained by him—and probably this is the only explanation that there is—in the secret contract which exists

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

between the episcopacy in the Catholic Church and the Center party in Germany: the Center party surrendered to the episcopacy the absolute control over theological science, while the episcopacy granted full sway to the Center party concerning all political and economic questions. Umberto Fracassini, rector at the Seminary for Priests in Perugia, reported in the *Studi Religiosi* the result of research work concerning the Gospels, when Loisy's writings were placed on the Index, hoping, however, that Bible criticism would not share the same fate, and therefore he reported all favorable Catholic opinions on Loisy. Fracassini had been highly esteemed by Pope Leo XIII, who appointed him a member of the Bible Commission. Pater Giovanni, professor of Holy Scriptures at the Seminary for Priests in Rome, managed the translation of the Gospels into the Italian, of which translation three hundred thousand copies were sold and distributed; he was soon after released of his position because of his hypercritical trend. The members of the circle which gathered about Minocchi, Fracassini, and

ITALY

Gennochi organized about 1895 in Rome into a "Society for Biblical Studies," but after Gennochi's trouble with the Vatican this society dissolved. Closely connected with this movement were Paolo Savi and Giovanni Semeria.

Many Italian Modernists have made shipwrecks of themselves in the flood of hyper-criticism, yet it must be admitted by impartial observers that their example seemed to be destined to become the salvation of the rest. According to the most radical of them, Christ is not pre-existent, nor of miraculous birth, nor risen from the dead. Miracles are no longer historical facts, but fanciful veilings for moral teachings. In the Synoptic Gospels affirmations regarding the humanity of Christ predominate, but have no trace of any claim to divinity, affirmed by Christ Himself. The Gospel of St. John is without historical foundation. The intention of the four evangelists was not to give us facts, but merely moral teachings. In the atmosphere of the Primitive Church it is not facts which created faith, but faith which created facts; simply meaning the sacred writers

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

did not first see, then believe, and then write, but they first believed, then imagined they saw, and then wrote. Now, with such a conception of Christ, and with a New Testament in which the divine is spurious, the grand is fantastic, and the human is either not original or to be taken with a grain of salt, a radical and a lasting reform in the Church would not be possible. So we must meet another class of Modernists.

When some Modernists in their reform tendencies laid most stress upon Biblical research work, others attempted to work in the field of practical religion, prompted by the demands of the time to reconcile the Church with the State and with society. Many priests could not understand why the pope would not forget the loss of the papal States, although his spiritual power should have gained by such a loss. Consequently the priests were not allowed to have any national patriotic feeling. This group of Modernists is represented by Christian democracy, led by Abate Romolo Murri. Christian democracy does not concern itself either with Biblical criticism or dogma; it has arisen in

ITALY

connection with the social question. It desires to bring happiness to the Italian people in longing and striving to hasten the time when oppression of the weak and poor will cease, when wealth will be wisely used, when the bonds of human brotherhood will be more closely woven by the awakened conscience of a great Christian solidarity, and when justice will be established on earth. It further seeks to remind Christians that the Kingdom of God is not only of heaven, but of the earth, and that Christ's Christianity does not aim at making egoistically happy individuals, but saves the individuals in order that they may serve as means to save the masses. It has been recognized by the Vatican that in our time it would not do to stamp as heretical such aspirations, so the movement of Christian democracy was directed, its policy limited from the very beginning, moderated and disciplined, and above all kept well secured within the boundaries of the Church by the papacy.

Abbate Murri and his supporters at this point of their reform work caused dissension between the Vatican and the social phase of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Modernism. The breach between progressive Catholics and the Vatican had to be complete, as an understanding with the papacy on the basis of the inauguration of some degree of reform was sought in vain. The movement, according to the Vatican, in order to be legitimate, ought to be subject to religious authority; the director of every social effort in the parish should be the priest; in the diocese the bishop; in the Church the pope. According to the Modernists, instead, the movement ought to be free in all its action, autonomous, genuinely democratic, altogether independent of religious authority. The dissension ended in a complete rupture, and the outlook regarding any genuine reform is considered hopeless.

The soul of this Christian-social work has been Romolo Murri. His life has been a chain of persecutions, a change of continual diving and reappearing in the stream of national and ecclesiastical politics. Rome condemned him in 1902 for the first time; in May, 1907, he was disciplined for the fifth time within two years, because he publicly criticised the Italian politics of the Vatican.

ITALY

He was then forbidden to officiate as priest any longer. His dogmatic position is incontestable. Toward the Holy See he has repeatedly shown a spirit of conciliation by suppressing his magazine *La Rivista di Cultura* in deference to the ecclesiastical authorities. The reappearance of this magazine was widely welcomed on the one hand, and fiercely condemned on the other, for the Abbot is immensely popular with the young Italian Catholics, both lay and clerical. Murri has been for about ten years the leader in the inner-Catholic movement in Italy. In his attitude he is not doctrinal.

Bishop Geremia Bonomelli, of Cremona, is another noble soul who fears that the old piety of the Church is attacked by the disease of an exaggerated and hysterical sentimentalism and fossilized into a nerveless formalism. His eyes are not closed to the actual facts within the Church, as his heart clings to the welfare of Italy and the priests whom he would serve with hand, pen, and lips. Listen to him as he addresses the priests of his diocese: "I have seen altars, dedicated to the Virgin and saints, hung with

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

silk draperies, brilliantly illuminated, and great crowds prostrated before them, and I rejoiced; but then I saw the altar of the Holy Sacrament only modestly adorned, with but one poor lamp before it, and few if any worshipers. . . . Many times it has fallen to my lot to take part in processions in which the Sacrament, or some relic, or images of the Virgin or saints were carried, and I have observed with mingled wonder and regret that few people uncovered as the Sacrament passed, but many knelt as the relics or images passed, thus inverting the parts. . . . Is everything correct in this external worship? Is there nothing in it which offends the Christian sense?" The importance of such words can not be denied, as they are spoken by a man high up on the ladder of the hierarchy, and held in great esteem and consideration by the Church. Such men as Bonomelli and Cardinal Alfonso Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua, could yet be a greater force, should they not only point out the evil, but propose an adequate remedy.

Until quite recently Padre Bartoli, a noted writer, preacher, journalist, and uni-

ITALY

versity professor, was in high honor among Roman Catholics. He was perhaps the most brilliant writer in the editorial columns of the *Civiltá Cattolica*, the leading organ of the extreme papal party in its opposition to modern movements within and without the Church. Because of his recognized ability Bartoli was asked to reply to an English attack upon the primacy of St. Peter. The outcome of that incident he portrays in his own words: "I thought it would be an easy thing to convince my Anglican writer of the weakness of his position; so I set to work immediately. In the course of my article I quoted against him certain words by St. Cyprian in his treatise 'De Unitate Ecclesiæ,' which, as it seemed to me, settled once for all the lawfulness of the claims of the papacy to universal domination. My friend the German Jesuit (who had asked him to write on the subject) read my article, smiled, stared at me, and asked me where I had studied my theology. 'You do not know,' he said, 'that the words you have just quoted were never uttered or written by St. Cyprian? And you mean to say that in Italy it

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

is not generally known that they are a later interpolation in St. Cyprian's works?"

"These words stung me to the quick. At first I wondered if my friend's bold assertion could be true; but a short study of the question convinced me that it was unquestionably so. Then I got very indignant at having been basely imposed upon by my professors of theology, who either through culpable ignorance were not aware of the famous interpolation in Cyprian's works or, in the interest of the papacy, had preferred to ignore it. I suspected, therefore, that as I had been once deceived in my studies, I might have been so, God knows, how often besides. In consequence I resolved there and then to study the whole of my theology over again for myself."

This conscientious priest spent ten years in the study of this subject, not trusting himself to write until it had been exhaustively considered. He says his studies were chiefly from Roman Catholic writers themselves, that he might not acquire any undue prejudice from Protestant sources. In 1907 he began to speak to the brethren of this order

ITALY

about these matters, and he was put under severe and humiliating discipline, but at the same time he was tempted by flattering offers on condition of his remaining silent. Bartoli could not so divide the allegiance of his soul between right and the Church. He esteemed truth as something above ecclesiastical teaching, especially after he had discovered that the ecclesiastical authority was itself without either Scriptural or historical basis. Since he has entered the Waldensian Church. This ex-Jesuit has been preaching every Sunday night in the large Waldensian church in Via Nazionale, where the edifice is crowded to the doors with an audience consisting chiefly of men. The addresses are delivered in Italian, and he captures the crowds in spite of the fact that he is a finished scholar and uses only the language of educated men.

We find the result of the studies of this eminent scholar in his book on "The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome." The work is comprehensive of the whole subject as well as clear and entertaining. Like the old Teuton reformer, Martin Luther, he has chosen between mental honesty with

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

persecution on the one hand, and the debauchery of his conscience and ease therewith on the other. Simply for reasonably and properly claiming to have a will of his own, and to preach and to write what he sincerely believed, he has been driven from his chair, forbidden to write in the papers and to enter the pulpit. So he has shaken off the yoke of the papacy and left the Jesuits, taking his place as a simple Christian with Murri, Minocchi, and Semeria—the latter a Barnabite monk and eminent scholar, who through his public lectures and his scholarly writings incurred the displeasure of the Vatican, and was therefore placed on the martyr-list of Modernists.

Some of the daring Modernists go in their utterances to such a length as to be obliged to conceal the name under a pseudonym; for these venturous men the question of the temporal power of the pope has been disposed of entirely. Here is what “Sibilla” says in the *Lettere Ghibelline*: “God conferred a blessing upon His Church when, through the force of events, He liberated her from that earthly power which subjected

ITALY

the great lordship of the Church to the smaller interests of a kingdom. The Ultramontanes of Italy fight for a cause which is dead and buried.” And further on: “In the Church a reform is necessary to lead back the flock of Christ to the spirit of the gospel.” Sibilla gives the essentials of this reform: “In the past the reform called for was the improvement of conduct and of discipline; at the present day the renovation required is of an intellectual kind; its aim is to see if the old interpretation of the Faith is adapted to our generation; if the primitive method of exegesis holds its own against the newer canons of historical criticism and research; if the mediæval concept of miracles should not be revised in the light of positive science; if it is sufficient to reply to new doubts, as formerly done, with the assertion of authority; if, in short, the human conception of Christianity should be the same for Jews converted in primitive times, for contemporaries of the scholastic period, and for the scientific believer of the twentieth century.” Through whom must this renovation come? “It must come from above, in

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

humble submission to the pope; and by first passing through the hierarchy, must propagate itself in the lower ranks of the Roman Catholic family."

Giuseppe Prezzolini, in his *Cattolicismo Rossa*, rightly says concerning this intellectual renovation: "If you ask these Modernists where the disease of the Roman Church—which, they say, is sick—lies, they answer: In the head. And if you ask them again: What remedy do you propose for its cure? they reply: A library." Professor Giovanni Luzzi, of Florence, says concerning the expectation of a reform from high places: "Will ever any reform come from the Vatican as it is? And history, does it not say that reforms begun from above most frequently remain there and do not descend to transform the masses, unless something more deep stir the masses and awaken in them a longing for what is truly divine? Did the great and beneficent Franciscan movement begin in the upper classes? By no means. It began in the lower classes; and though it was finally recognized and accepted by the Church, much hostility had it first to over-

ITALY

come." The younger part of the clergy is beginning to prepare itself for an ecclesiastical revolution which is found in the atmosphere and conditions of Roman Catholicism in Italy.

A number of priests, formed in a group, wrote a letter addressed to Pope Pius X and entitled, "Quel Che Vogliamo" (What We Want): "Our society has now for many years held entirely aloof from the Church, which it considers as an ancient and inexorable foe. The old cathedrals, which the piety of free believing peoples of the Middle Ages raised to the Virgin and to patron saints, are utterly deserted; men no longer care to draw from religion the strength and light necessary to the soul agitated by daily struggles; respect and veneration for all that has been held most sacred from the cradle has vanished. And not only that, but the Church is considered an obstacle to the happiness of the nations; the priest is insulted in public as a common, ignorant parasite; the gospel and Christianity are regarded as expressions of a delayed civilization because they are entirely insufficient to answer to the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ideals of freedom, justice, and science which are shaking the masses. Few have remained faithful to their religious traditions, and even this minority shows symptoms of decay and lifelessness. For these few religion, with its cold observance of formulas and traditional precepts, is no longer a directing force in their life; church-going men are a small number; church-going women are slowly becoming rarer; and the young are growing up more than ever refractory to all religious education.” Is it therefore any wonder when the young Italian priests are widely embracing Modernistic views and in the higher ranks of the priesthood they find able and courageous leaders, when occasionally earnest men cross the boundary and find shelter in the Protestant camp, while the multitudes who still remain are frankly rebellious and claim that in the existing situation rebellion is a sacred right?

On the 27th day of April, 1902, a society was formed called “The Pious Society of St. Gerome for the Spreading of the Holy Gospels.” They might be called the practical Modernists, as they want to lead the

ITALY

people back to the true source of spiritual life. It has been their effort to place the conscience of the people into the immediate contact with the Christ of the Gospels, so that the spiritualizing of worship and the restoration of dogmatic formula can follow. To accomplish this end they immediately prepared and widely distributed a new translation of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. It seemed as if the society could not have begun its work under better auspices. More than two hundred bishops had signified their approval of it, and many had promised their assistance. The pope had granted an indulgence of three hundred days to the faithful who read the Gospels for at least a quarter of an hour once a day. After three years the society had circulated three hundred thousand copies of the book. In 1907 the eight hundred and eightieth thousand of the small volume was issued from the Vatican printing-press, and in 1908 the number had not fallen far short of a million, while it was known that the society was working with alacrity at the preparation of the rest of the New Testament. But the little

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

volume in its general aspect, with its index of passages from the Old Testament quoted in the New, with its little concordance and synoptic tables, its underlined verses, its illustrations, and its cheap price, savored too much of Protestantism not to be unpalatable to some; and the society was soon denounced as one whose object was "a new kind of dangerous propaganda." When the Curia perceived that the fortunes of the society were very different from what it had expected, it became diffident and nervous, the general introduction and the notes were amended, touched up, and corrected in the Vatican's own way, and the grave of the society dug. It has not killed the society directly, but has so managed that it should expire gradually, slowly, by itself.

Although foreign influences, mostly the French, have caused to some extent the Modernist trend in Italy, it must also not be forgotten that many domestic conditions greatly influenced the laity and clergy alike. Among others mention must be made of the great Italian poet and author, Antonio Fogazzaro (born 1842 in Vicenza, died 1911 in

ITALY

Venice). He was the author of "Il Santo," a novel which five years ago came under the disfavor of the Holy See. Fogazzaro is familiar with all the evils within the Roman Catholic Church; evils which have caused the lingering disease of the Church: the high regard of the Church for her outward position, for worldly power and ostentation, the heaping of devotional exercises, the tenacious adherence to traditions and inheritance, the suppression of independence, especially with the laity, out of which a spirit of want of truth and falseness arises. These he considers the chief reasons for the present condition. According to this novel, "The Saint," salvation can only come through men who live in direct and vital contact with God, to whom piety is not only a fountain of submission but a power for action; men who will cheerfully perform their duty in humility, and not within the bounds of inherited forms. He drew sharp pictures of the Roman prelates, and consequently his book was placed on the Index, April 5, 1906. The prohibition of the sale of this book did by no means hurt the circulation; the placing

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

of it on the Index rather helped it. In Italy alone in October, 1906, thirty thousand copies were sold; in the United States, after the appearance of the first English translation, in seventeen days fourteen thousand copies; in England, at the close of 1906, daily one thousand copies, while even in Germany the sale was enormous, though the tenor of the book was exclusively religious, as it dealt with the Roman Catholic question. In January, 1907, Fogazzaro gave a lecture in Paris on "The Religious Ideas of Giovanni Selva," the leading character in the book, in which he said that Selva was no imaginary person, but his name is legion and could be found in France, England, Germany, America, and Italy. Every page of "Il Santo" proves how loyal Selva and his family were originally toward their Church, but how the continuous persecutions of Pope Pius X made them obstinate.

Multitudes of Italian priests are frankly rebellious and claim that in the existing situation rebellion is a sacred right. Altogether we are presented here with a picture of a vessel where the crew, in increasing num-

ITALY

bers, are in a state of mutiny. For the most part they do not intend to leave the ship, but to capture it. They believe they can, but meanwhile the captain is engaged in taking measures of his own to throw them overboard. Reform must come from the direction of the young priesthood, men who live in contact not only with ideas but with facts. Between these men and the Vatican, however, an abyss lies; the words coming from the Vatican to the young clergy are for them no longer words of authority and power. They are grieved to see the formalism, the paganism, the superstition into which the Church has fallen; they have no longer any confidence in the Curia, that seems to have lost nearly all of its power in the things that are of God. According to the leading scholars in the Catholic Church of Italy, this great Church with its episcopal ritual, its strong ecclesiastical organization, its glorious traditions, with its majestic cathedrals, erected to God by the piety of former generations, is the Church which seems to the young clergy best to respond to the genius and temperament of the Latin races. Over

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

this great historical Church a primate is desired, exercising not a juridical and tyrannical, but a spiritual and human authority, where pontiff, cardinal, bishop, and priest are inspired with the Spirit of Christ, and where God is worshiped in the cathedrals in spirit and in truth. In their "Open Letter to Pius X" they said, "We are not rebels, but sincere Catholics; and as such we desire to stand up for the salvation of Christianity."

Recently laymen have begun to interest themselves in the movement. One reason for their lethargy up to this time has been the widespread indifference among them for everything connected with the Church, and especially the profound distrust of the clergy which has grown up among them. But facts are happening which are producing in the laity a deep impression in favor of Modernism. Professor Luzzi, of Florence, recites one of these facts, which relates to the recent anniversary of the fall of the papal temporal power, when the mayor of Rome made a speech lauding civil and religious liberty, and denouncing the moral and spiritual ty-

ITALY

ranny of the papacy. The pope replied to the speech with a protest filled with "poor and dull lamentation." The incident created great general interest, and both mayor and pope received messages from their respective sympathizers. One of the messages to the mayor was published throughout Italy and aroused much enthusiasm. It was from a large group of priests representing the Modernist movement, and contained the following sentences: "On the 20th of September you knew how to find in the tradition of the Eternal City the human and universal words of liberty, right to live, which the Vatican no longer knows how to herald, and you spoke to Italy and to the world in a Roman way. . . . The Vatican has uplifted its voice in the name of the Church against your assertions; but the Vatican, inasmuch as it has always hindered the progress of Christianity, has no right to speak in the name of the Church. The best part of the Church in Italy does not want to be an accomplice of the Vatican in the fatal program of open war against the unity of the country, against the evolution of thought and liberty of con-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

science. . . . Still a great hope lives in our hearts, the hope that the Church may yet find new ways to become, as the gospel says, 'the light of the world' and 'the salt of the earth.' In the name of those who are longing for freedom and truth we rejoice in the opportunity we have to-day of expressing to you our gratitude and sympathy." There are difficult days lying ahead of the papacy in Italy. But Modernism, inspired by the Spirit of Christ, strongly organized, supported by the laity and led by a great leader, will guide the old Church in the fair land of Italia, and she will see again days of freedom and life.

III

FRANCE

THE picture changes entirely and becomes theologically interesting when we place our foot on French soil. Here it is not a battle for freedom of conscience and belief, not a struggle for a common education; theology is here in the foreground. It is a battle for theological principles which originated in France and found their way gradually into Italy. Historic-critical searching of the Scriptures and the new post-Kantian and Kantian philosophy, as it appears to the scientific man, are wrestling with a scholasticism—which seems to appear unscientific to the world—for the truth within the Catholic fold; this threatens not only the Catholic dogma as such, but the historical and philosophical foundation of the dogma as it has been understood. In reality here one meets what Pope Pius X calls “Modernism:” the critical research of the original Christianity and the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

acceptance of the new, especially the Kantian, philosophy. This is the Hydra, the water serpent with its many heads, which the pope seems bound to kill.

Catholic theology in its criticism of the Biblical text will always meet two difficulties which seem to be an obstacle in the research work of the Catholic theologian, as can be plainly seen in French Modernism. The first difficulty is the Decree of the Council of Trent, when tradition was declared to be equally with the Bible a rule of faith; when the Vulgate was proclaimed to be the authentic version of the Bible and the Church its only interpreter; when, further, the hypothesis of verbal inspiration was declared as dogmatically binding. Secondly, the fact that the Catholic Church will not recognize and accept a gradual formation and development of the dogmas of the Church, but assumes that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the Sinlessness of the Virgin Mary, and the doctrine of the Infallibility of the pope were in the primitive Church even in New Testament time commonly accepted. No Catholic Bible student may alter these assumptions.

FRANCE

Will he reach scientific results, according to which he concludes that by way of reasoning, based upon historical research, a doctrine is historically untenable or suspicious, he must either renounce the result of his labors or begin his research anew.

One of the first Modernists is found in the prominent French Roman Catholic theological author of an increasingly liberal type, Abbé de Lamennais (1782-1854). In his earlier works he advocated the separation of the Church from the State, which oppressed and fettered it, and more freedom for the people as well as for the Church. After the July revolution of 1830 he began to publish *L'Avenir*, a newspaper whose motto was, "God and Freedom; the Pope and the People." The bishops now began to bring formal charges against Lamennais; he went to Rome in 1832, but found little support, and his ideas were condemned by the new pope, Gregory XVI. The publication of *L'Avenir* was abandoned. Later he gave way to the logical developments of his liberal principles, marking a definite breach with Rome by the publication of "The Words of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

a Believer," which was condemned, but made a deep impression upon the people, whom he addressed in his glowing words of hope and love. His work, "The Book of the People," reminds them not only of their rights, but in the tone of an inspired prophet of their duties also. After producing a number of fugitive writings of democratic tendency, he attempted to bring his new ideas into harmony with his original principles, according to which the truth is determined not by the Church, but by human reason, examining, judging, and confirming. He had a noble and active nature, never content unless at work. His unselfish piety and humility were unquestioned; but the failure of all his plans so embittered a positive and passionate disposition as to lead him far away from the principles with which he began his life into a position which his early associates considered little short of apostasy.

Pope Leo XIII was not a Liberal, but he was scholarly and a friend of scholars. He was therefore anxious to bring Catholic scholarship up to the level of Protestant scholarship. With this end in view he threw

FRANCE

open the Vatican library to students; he made overtures to the Liberals—creating Newman a cardinal, and entering into negotiations with Döllinger, the historian and leader of the Old-Catholic movement; he encouraged historical research. An ecclesiastic, and a man rather of letters than of learning, he did not really understand the Liberal mind and standpoint, or see how wide a departure from tradition it involved. When it became evident that things were going further than he thought, he was puzzled and temporized. Pope Leo XIII was an opportunist by policy and by temperament; he was unwilling to break either with the past or the present; he was old, and left the decision to his successor—not foreseeing that his successor would be Pius X.

The impulse thus given to learning by the pope produced a brilliant group of French Catholic scholars, d'Hulst, Duchesne, Loisy, Hébert, Houtin, Batiffol; the “*Insti-
tuts Catholiques*” were developed; a new era, it seemed, had set in. The records of distinguished men who have dreamed the fair dream of a renovated Catholicism in France

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

will receive a testimony of honesty and fairness by impartial students, although the Liberal school was suspected by the Vatican later of being a school of the Pharisees and the Sadducees. One of its most distinguished pioneers was a man whose services to Catholic scholarship it would be difficult to overestimate, the Abbé, now Mgr. Louis Marie Olivier Duchesne, who held the chair of Church History in the Institut Catholique de Paris from 1877 to 1895, and since the latter year has been director of the French school at Rome.

Mgr. Duchesne had the learning of a Neander and the irony of a Voltaire; when he began to apply the critical method in his Bible study, his lectures were suspended for one year. He belonged with other scholars to the new school of the "Progressives," and their first books were placed on the Index in 1887. They looked upon this step of the Vatican very calmly, for the condemnation of their books through the Index they deemed by no means a condemnation of their doctrine, it simply meant for them the prohibition to read certain books; they further

FRANCE

thought that the suppression of their books was founded undoubtedly upon the fear of the newness of their theories, which, being made public without special preparation, would undermine the faith of the common people. Even orthodoxy could not pardon Duchesne; it dreaded at once his encyclopædic knowledge and his incisive tongue. He taught men to see. For what they saw he was not answerable; but it was not what the Church wished them to see. His examination of the legends which attached to the foundation of the great French Churches, though based on the work of such eminent scholars as Tillemont and the Bollandists, gave offense to modern piety, while his “*Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*” (1877), saved with difficulty from the Index, demonstrated the presence of fable in the records of the earliest period of the Christian community at Rome. He refrained from drawing the theological conclusions indicated by his historical criticism. But these conclusions could not fail to suggest themselves to his pupils. The study of the papal assumptions on Christian origins, seriously under-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

taken by Duchesne, led to a new conception of ecclesiastical dogma and institutions; Roman Catholic traditions and science could not keep house together in one mind.

Roman Catholic scholars in France in their investigations were using the methods of research followed by modern scholarship in general. In addition to the introduction of modern systems of philosophy and theology, many Roman Catholics were devoting themselves to Biblical criticism along non-traditional lines. In both these respects the antagonism between the new methods and the new teaching and the traditions of the Roman system on its intellectual side became acute. Exegesis seemed at first sight less dangerous than history. Catholics, who build on Scripture plus and interpreted by tradition, could deal more freely, it was thought, with the sacred texts than Protestants, who build on Scripture alone. This reasoning, however, overlooked what may be called the regulative function of the Bible. It is not necessary that either the formulas or the institutions of the Protestant Church should be found in Scripture; and as a matter of

FRANCE

fact they are not found there. But it is necessary that they should not be in conflict with it. And reference to the sources showed, as it had shown at the Reformation, that this was the case.

Concerning Biblical criticism, Pope Leo XIII issued, November 18, 1893, his encyclical "Providentissimus," which can be considered as the first declaration of the Vatican against higher criticism. This encyclical of 1893 disputed the right of higher criticism which would only recognize internal reasons for the inspiration; as a rule such reasons should simply and only be used to strengthen the external testimony. All the books which the Church considers as canonical and holy must be completely understood according to their extent and contents as having been written under the direct guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As God Himself is infallible and could not inspire heresy, so the books of the Church must therefore be certainty and truth. D'Hulst, who had been the leader in exegesis as Duchesne in history, wrote to Rome that he would no longer entertain the idea that the infallibility of the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Scriptures refers only to questions of faith and conduct; this is no longer his personal opinion, and he would yield to the pope's advice.

The papal encyclical against "Modernism" is largely directed against Loisy, the most eminent of French Bible critics, who in his methods practically agreed with Wellhausen, Schmiedel, and Van Manen. Loisy, in addition to being a critic, also in several works attempted a synthesis dealing with the history of dogma and the principles of religious psychology.

Alfred Firman Loisy was born at Ambrières, February 28, 1857. He was educated at the Seminary of Châlons and was ordained to the priesthood in 1879, after which he was parish priest of Broussy-le-Grand and Landricourt (1879-81). In 1881 he became lecturer in Hebrew at the Institut Catholique of Paris; was appointed associate professor in 1882, and titular professor of Holy Scripture in 1889. The freedom of his views, however, caused such distrust of his orthodoxy that in 1893 he was removed from the Institut and appointed chaplain of the

FRANCE

Dominical nuns engaged in teaching at Neuilly-sur-Seine. In 1899 he retired to Bellevue, and in 1900-04 lectured at the Sorbonne on Assyriology, but in the latter year was again obliged by his superiors to cease lecturing. Since that time he has lived in retirement at Garney. His works attracted considerable attention, and five of his books in 1903 were placed on the Index, although Loisy claims to seek in them to refute the radicalism of Dr. Adolf Harnack and to defend the orthodox faith of the Church. This learned French ecclesiastic, Ex-Abbé Loisy, whose excommunication in 1908 created so great a sensation, is still the subject of widespread interest. His vast erudition and charming style as a writer have combined to enhance his European reputation. His appointment by the French Government to the chair of History of Religions in the College of France is naturally provocative of different expressions of opinion. For it is impossible to regard him simply as a victim of the uncompromising papal policy. It is only fair to recognize that the type of Modernism of which Loisy is a leading representative is

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

as destructive to Protestantism as to Catholicism, for it is so utterly extreme and so absolutely drastic that it entirely eliminates every belief cherished by all evangelical Christians.

The dogmatical precepts of Loisy were very carefully formulated. He claimed that one could never find a satisfactory solution of the Biblical problems from a dogmatical standpoint. The Biblical question is above all things a historical question; the point is not to determine whether the Bible contains errors, but whether the truths claimed for the Bible by the Church can be historically proven. He expresses his position in the following precepts: 1. The Pentateuch can not be the work of Moses as it has been delivered to us. 2. The first chapters in the Bible do not give an exact and true account and history of the origin of man. 3. The books of the Old Testament and different parts of the individual books have not the same historical value. 4. All the historical books of the Scriptures, also of the New Testament, were edited with far greater liberty than the works of modern historical research; the liberty

FRANCE

which prevailed at the time when these books were written grants the scholar certain liberties in the exposition of the Scriptures. 5. The history of the Christian doctrine, as far as it is found in the Bible, shows an evolution in all its parts in regard to the perception and knowledge of God, the destination of man, and the moral law. 6. In regard to all things in the kingdom of nature the Bible is not superior to the common prevailing view of antiquity. His method was very radical, as can be seen when he dealt on scientific lines with the Canon, the religion of Israel, and when he taught that Babylonian myths were lying behind the first chapters of Genesis.

In 1902 Abbé Loisy criticised Professor Adolf Harnack's famous "*Wesen des Christentums*" (The Essence of Christianity) in his no less famous "*L'Évangile et Église*" (The Gospel and the Church), in which he refuted the radicalism of the famous Harnack and challenged the distrust and disapproval of Rome. To the average orthodoxy, Catholic or Protestant, "*The Gospel and the Church*," it must be admitted, was an enigma.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

matic book. As a critic Loisy went beyond Harnack, emphasizing more strongly the apocalyptic features in Christ's teaching, its points of contact with the mind of his time, its undogmatic and unsystematic character, and the absence from it of any provision for the organization of the Christian community. Most startling of all, he abandoned the attempt to prove the Resurrection of Christ on the ground of history; it was a fact, he argued—here agreeing with Harnack—not of history, but for faith. In his monumental commentary on the Gospels he proceeds resolutely, perhaps rather ruthlessly, on the same lines; his conclusions do not materially differ from those of such scholars as Jülicher and Weiss, whose position in theology is that of a rigid limitation to strict historical investigation.

This radical French Modernist, Mgr. Loisy, disclaims a speculative philosophy. The time, he probably thinks, is not ripe for such a construction; and meanwhile, with the help of such notions as symbolism and evolution, the scholar can hold his own. Ultimately, however, a philosophical foundation

FRANCE

is a necessity; it is impossible to state the simplest fact without philosophical implications, because thought is one. The philosophy on which Catholic theology is built, and which from first to last it implies, is the Thomist-Aristotelian; and the Aristotelian ontology which underlies this, underlies the language and thought of the average man.

Another victim in this battle is Mgr. Battifol, rector of the Institut Catholique at Toulouse. He is neither a radical Bible critic nor a philosophical Modernist, and plainly spoke against Loisy in 1904; but Battifol has written a history of the Roman breviary, in which he criticised a number of absurd Roman Catholic legends and traditions. This breviary, which must be devotionally used in prayer by the clerics, contains actually stories, according to Battifol, which can hardly be believed. About St. Scholastica, who, being dissatisfied with beautiful weather, bowed over the table and asked for bad weather, after which thunder and lightning appeared. About St. Patrick, who daily prayed the whole Book of Psalms and three hundred times bowed his knees before God,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

who divided his nights into three parts, in the second part diving under in cold water and praying in that position Psalms 101-150, while later he slept on a bare stone in the third part. Another saint had his hand amputated, which later grew on again. These and other legends were believed and not examined in mediæval times; but woe unto the cleric who nurtures modern views in his research work of history. Battifol simply lost his chair; it availed him nothing that he proved his dogmatic orthodoxy before the pope.

Not all the Modernists in France are extreme radicals. Too commonly it is supposed that all Modernists in France stand for a violent and bitter attack upon the authenticity and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and one readily allows that the hail-storm of books and pamphlets which has fallen in recent years upon France would be sufficient to justify such an opinion. But it should be remembered that with many French scholars Modernism means no more than the habit of mind which searches and tries the truth of things. It is called scienc-

FRANCE

tific, an expression which has misled many. A scientific way of examining the Christian faith is, after all, only to separate out of the theological dogma what is merely legendary and traditional. Or, as Abbé Houtin writes in "La Crise du Clergé:" "By Modernism we denote the tendency to disentangle religious sentiment from its theological shell; to distinguish the imperishable from the ephemeral, the eternal from the transitory, the essential from accretions." Naturally, therefore, it includes not only the most reckless (and actually unscientific) criticism, but also, which is just now to be observed, the most reverent and devout handling of the Word of God. The number of books about the Bible and the primitive Christian faith written in France within the last ten years is legion; and still they come. They betray by their number as much as by their quality the intensity of the movement by which they have been inspired.

It is estimated by loyal French priests within the Catholic Church that the number of priests who are in the current of Modernism and who at heart have rejected the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

papacy is about fifteen hundred. Macaulay said, "A man who does not change his opinions is either an inspired angel or an unmitigated fool." That is what fifteen hundred priests have actually declared during the last ten years, and they have consequently unfrocked themselves. To use their own words, they have "thrown the soutane to the nettles." That Rome is not reformable from within, they are perfectly sure. No chipping off of ecclesiastical excrescences can make Rome a Christian Church. Papal allocutions only make matters worse. As Jeremy Taylor said, "You can not cure a man's rheumatism by brushing his clothes." Nothing short of actual, definite, and out-and-out conversion from the pope to Christ can save France, or any other Catholic people. The day of legendary and traditional dogma, like the day of aristocracy in Church and State, is near its setting. The world has suffered long and severely from both, but the brighter day of light and liberty is clearing rapidly for the Catholic peoples.

A rather striking discrimination is noticeable in the recent campaign against Modern-

FRANCE

ism; it has often been hard to decide exactly upon what principle the official condemnations were made. Individual priests were disciplined in France, after the papal encyclical had been published, who were not known to have written or spoken anything resembling the tenets condemned in the papal documents. The leaders of the Christian Democratic movement in France and Italy have been especially singled out for this treatment. There is apparently a kind of unofficial political and social Modernism as distasteful to the authorities at Rome as the critical and philosophical type. Papal pronouncements have taken no account specifically of this development, but the social Modernist appears to be in an even more precarious position than the philosophical Modernist. The French editor, Laberthonniere, who has been especially active in substituting a newly-modeled Christian system of philosophy in place of scholasticism, and his review, though it has been a clearing-house for many French Modernistic writers, has escaped excommunication. But several of the French clergy who edited Christian

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Democratic newspapers favorable to the Republic and loyally accepting disestablishment have been disciplined.

The Vatican authorities as representing Catholicism should endeavor to regain the confidence of the French people who are on the verge of atheism, for it is indeed a democracy without God that is establishing itself in France on the ruins of the old ecclesiastical establishments. It is only just to Catholicism to say that it continues its struggle with official atheism, yet it must also be admitted that many papal tendencies did not tend to conserve any confidence. A war which seems likely not to come soon to an end is still being waged in France between the bishops of the Roman Church and the teachers of the public schools. The determined prelates, representing the powerful though disestablished and largely disendowed Gallican Church, formulated their grievance in a very demonstrative method. They issued an open letter denouncing the teachings in the school as atheistic, immoral, and unpatriotic. The object of the bishops is to introduce Vaticanism in the shape of

FRANCE

religion by such books as Rome would approve for the suppression of some books now in use. The whole scholastic profession arose, as the accusation of atheism infuriated them, for the purpose of self-vindication, and rapidly formed an association of ninety-six thousand members. While the Church in France is passing through a serious crisis resulting from the separation of the Church from the State, while even the government is frankly and officially atheistic to such a degree that in the Chamber of Deputies a minister dared to say, in words which have become celebrated, and which caused deep indignation in many circles, that "the lights of heaven which had given to men lying hopes were henceforth and forever extinguished," while children in some quarters are trained to hate God and those who speak of Him, yet there can be no doubt that dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church have often gone much too far in their opposition to the secular power.

Pasteur Georges Dieny says: "In these conditions the difficulties of our task may be imagined. Yet I believe in the future of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Protestantism. Already in scientific and philosophical circles there is less of the dogmatic materialistic accent, and there is a new tendency to examine and to study religious ideas." Mention should be made of the remarkable Roman Catholic congress which held its third annual meeting in Paris. Its purpose is the promotion of spirituality among Christian (Roman Catholic) families. Its watchword is, "Back to the Gospel." Its chief aims are thus stated: 1. Return to the ancient custom of evening prayers, which are to be followed by the reading of some verses of Scripture. 2. Reading of the Bible in school and catechism classes, in meetings of societies and in teachers' classes. 3. Public reading of the Bible at all masses without a sermon. 4. Presentation of Bibles to those who are confirmed or married, and use of the Bible as a premium in the schools. Thus once more is revealed the longing of many Roman Catholics for the Word of God. May God help the pope and his advisers to heed the signs of the time in the light of modern conditions! One might be struck with the fact that two thousand years ago the Gallican

FRANCE

temperament was the same as to-day, as he reads Julius Cæsar's "Gallic War," or as he considers the outlook in France stormy, or as the spiritual condition might suggest pessimistic conclusions; yet true Catholicism, not influenced by the pope's Italian or Spanish advisers, and the Church of God as found in the Protestant branches of Christendom, must find the one means of salvation in the faith in Jesus Christ as the only Mediator between God and man and a consistent Christian life.

IV

GERMANY

IN dealing with the problem of Modernism in Germany, one must take into consideration the movement of the Old Catholic Church, which owes its origin to certain Roman Catholics who refused to accept the decree of the Vatican Council of 1870 affirming the infallibility of the pope. The decree had been fiercely debated and opposed by a considerable minority of the bishops present at the council, their arguments being based upon the early history of the Church and her fundamental faith and usages as declared by the ecumenical councils. After the issuance of the decree the opposing minority met at Nuremberg, August 27, 1870, and the professors from Bonn, Breslau, Braunsberg, Munich, Münster, Prague, Würzburg, and other places, under the leadership of Johann Josef Ignaz von Döllinger, declared against the decree. A gathering of laymen at Kö-

GERMANY

nigswinter in September, 1870, resolved that, "Considering that the council did not deliberate in perfect freedom, the undersigned Catholics (1,359 in number) do not recognize the decree concerning the absolute power of the pope and his infallibility as the decision of an ecumenical council, but rather reject them as innovations in direct contradiction to the uniform faith of the Church." In faith and practice only the doctrines which are deemed apostolic are recognized.

Johann Josef Ignaz von Döllinger, Church historian and leader of the Old Catholic movement, was born at Bamberg, February 28, 1799, and died at Munich, January 10, 1890. He saw the principal mission of himself and his friends in the desire not only to maintain freedom of faith and conscience, but also the independence of Church and State, with a similar basis for all religious societies. The opposition to him, which began in 1849, because of his national Church tendencies never waned. The Archbishop of Munich, Count von Reisach, a Jesuit scholar, denounced him. While at Rome he was regarded with the greatest mistrust. At Eas-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ter of 1861, at the request of certain ladies of the nobility that he say something regarding the situation in Italy, he gave his Odeon lectures, in which he considered the possibility of the fall of the papal State. The nuncio left the hall in the middle of the discourse, and the Roman Catholic world was thrown into great excitement. Meanwhile a great conflict broke out between the Jesuits and the German theologians. No unscholastic theologian or philosopher was accepted as trustworthy, no theological faculty as Catholic, which was not held by the Jesuits. On September 28, 1863, opened the conference of German Catholic scholars with Döllinger's celebrated lecture on "Die Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der katholischen Theologie" (The Past and Present of Catholic Theology). A severe breach widened rapidly. His "Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages" appeared in 1863, in which he criticised the Donation of Constantine. Consequently in 1864 the lectures of Döllinger were put under the ban. Archbishop Scherr, of Munich, considered that it would be the best solution of all the difficul-

GERMANY

ties if Döllinger should die of the attack of pneumonia from which he was then suffering.

When the Vatican Council met in Rome in 1870, Cardinal Schwarzenberg urged upon Döllinger that, at least as a private individual, he should attend the Council; but he preferred to remain in Munich, where he published regularly in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* his "Briefe vom Konzil" (Letters from the Council), based upon material furnished him from Rome. He then was called a heretic. Bishop Ketteler, of Mainz, and other bishops of the minority, in an open letter addressed to him begged of him to keep silent. He complied, and on July 18, 1870, the personal infallibility of the pope and his universal episcopacy were declared an article of faith. Döllinger declined to give up what he had hitherto taught, and on April 18, 1871, Archbishop Scherr, himself an opponent to infallibility in the Council, caused his excommunication. Döllinger acknowledged the fact of excommunication, but pronounced it unrighteous, and therefore futile. He considered himself and his associates as still Roman Catholics. He opposed the organi-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

zation of a separate Church, but soon threw in his lot with the Old Catholics. According to Döllinger the very highest aim of Christ-like development was to unite the now divided Christian communions. Döllinger at last understood better how to appreciate Luther, "that Titan of the spiritual world." He makes in an academical lecture on the Reformation (1882) this confession: "I must admit that, for a greater portion of my life, what occurred in Germany from 1517 to 1552 was an impenetrable riddle and, moreover, a subject of sorrow and pain. I saw only the fact of the separation, and the two halves of the nation, divided as by the sharp blows of a sword, standing inimical to each other. Since examining more closely the history of Germany and of Rome in the Middle Ages, and since the experiences of these later years have so illuminated the subjects of my research, I now believe that I understand what was so enigmatical, and I adore the ways of Providence, in whose almighty hand the German nation became an instrument—a vessel in the house of God, and not one unto dishonor."

GERMANY

Catholic theological scholarship in Germany is not as far advanced in learning as in France; this must be conceded. So Modernism has had fewer victims in Germany and Austria. This is not because the movement has not many sympathizers there, but largely because the critics of the traditional system of the Roman Catholic Church are professors in Roman Catholic universities where they have the protection of the State. The Roman Catholics of Germany have been more stirred by the case of Hermann Schell, a Roman Catholic professor at Würzburg, who was disciplined from Rome because of his non-scholastic system of theology; but his case occurred several years before the encyclical was published and before the Modernistic agitation commenced. Indeed, the genesis of the present policy of the Roman Church may be studied in separate cases of condemnation, some going back a number of years, where what is now called Modernism is foreshadowed vaguely, both as regards the teaching held by and the condemnations issued from Rome. This is applicable to

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Schell's Ideal-Catholicism as well as to the efforts of the German Reform-Catholics.

Hermann Schell was born at Freiburg, February 28, 1850, and died at Würzburg, May 31, 1906. He originally was found on the side of the Thomist-Aristotelian philosophy, but was later attracted by the Plattonian system. These later tendencies, however, necessitated that he fight an unbroken battle with the newer philosophy. In 1884 he was called to the chair of Apologetics and Archæology at the University of Würzburg, where, besides his being a very successful teacher, he exerted a fruitful literary activity. Worthy of special mention is his "Catholic Dogmatic in Six Volumes," which he wrote in 1889-1893. This work was very favorably received. Not knowing that it would be placed on the Index later, Catholic papers published laudable reviews. This was the first attempt to place the Catholic dogma all along the line in the modern perspective. When in 1896 the new university building was dedicated, Schell gave it the name "Veritati," and in his famous dedicatory address on "Theology and the University" he re-

GERMANY

marked that the building was dedicated to the spirit of truth. No tradition should ever hinder progress. His first work on Reform-Catholicism appeared in 1897 under the title, "Catholicism the Principle of Progress." Against the vulgar Catholicism, as it had been evident, he described Catholicism as it should and could be, as the "Idealkatholizismus," which demanded the theological and practical management of religion.

In specific matters the following points were advocated by him: 1. The Catholic laity must be better made use of in the service of the Church; the educated classes, and especially the men, must be won not by certain inducements, but through rational comprehension, proofs, and explanation of the doctrine. To accomplish this end, one must not, self-satisfied and proud, reject the achievements of modern thinking. Even secular things must be spiritualized by the supernatural power and truth of Christianity; a world of ideas which delight in the phantastic should not be nurtured. 2. Theological science must retain its proper place in universities, it must be free and independent, it

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

must not be confined to the seminaries; other scientific research must also be undertaken by Catholics and in the Catholic spirit. Difficulties should not hinder, if sufficient confidence is placed in the truth of the Christian faith, then genius can freely and without molestation search in its respective fields.

3. Catholicism must, being based upon principle and being energetic, work for the progress of science, civilization, and political advancement not only so far as it can absorb the results of foreign research, but it must also endeavor to gain first place.

4. Believing in the future of the Catholic mind and genius in the Germanic world, Catholics must energetically work for the national advance of Germany, they must lay more stress upon what the German mind expects in religion, in theological experience, and in the practical application of the Christian faith.

Dogmatically Schell was a Catholic and wanted to remain a Catholic; yet in all of his works, especially those of an apologetic nature, we find in him not the defender of Catholicism, but of Christianity. He plainly showed the distinction between the form and

GERMANY

essence of religion. So he always paid due respect and justice to Protestantism. How his struggles strengthened him is shown again in his later work on "Die neue Zeit und der alte Glaube" (The New Time and the Old Faith). Here Schell spoke very little of the objective side of the Catholic dogma, but the spirit was the spirit of the modern, energetic, and inner Christianity, not of mediæval Catholicism. His foundation was the gospel and modern civilization. He considered for his Catholic friends the most essential part in worship to be not in devotion to the saints, but in direct communion with God, in the saving mysteries, as found in the Atonement and in His great works.

The "Congregation of the Index" took exception to numerable portions of Schell's dogmatic and apologetic books. 1. The only deadly sin for eternal punishment, according to the author, is the sin against the Holy Spirit. 2. He was accused of denying the eternal hell-punishment, except for complete obduracy in this life. 3. The criterion of judgment will be the love to our neighbor, therefore baptism and the anointing with oil

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

are not considered necessary. 4. Schell's idea of God rests upon a false principle of God and personality; this can not be taught without insulting the scholastic teachers. 5. The mystery of the Trinity is not sufficiently explained. Schell's books were placed on the Index December 15, 1898. Soon after, Schell submitted to Rome, to the sorrow of some of his closest friends. In 1906 he was disciplined again, being accused of sowing the poison of heresy through his teaching in the university, in his lectures, and in his literary works.

Among the German "Reformkatholiken" will be found Dr. Josef Müller. He published in 1898 his "Der Reformkatholizismus die Religion der Zukunft" ("Reform-Catholicism the Religion of the Future"). In the practical part of this book Müller contended that the Bible should be read by everybody, for to prohibit it means danger for the Church, as many Catholics would affiliate with Protestantism. We must also mention Franz Xaver Kraus (died 1890); he was professor of Church History at Freiburg. In 1904 the "Krausgesellschaft" was founded

GERMANY

in his honor at Munich; this society has aimed to promote the deepening of the Christian life and to further harmony between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

During the later years the struggle has become more severe and acute in Germany; the Catholic Church is in increasing difficulty with its Modernists. Numerous scholars decline to accept the dicta of the Church without examination of the authority on which they rest. The latest trouble was caused by Professor Josef Schnitzer's book "Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet?" ("Did Christ Found the Papacy?") Schnitzer is another "Romanist heretic" and an old offender who has been giving trouble for a number of years. He has held with rare distinction academic positions in the universities of Würzburg and Munich, the two distinguished higher schools of Catholic learning in Bavaria. As a priest he has been repeatedly warned, and repeatedly has he expressed regret for the boldness of his words. But this latest book surpasses all previous utterances. As a result he has been suspended by the pope and granted a furlough by the Bavarian

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Government, and rumors are rife that if he refuses to withdraw it from publication he will be placed under the greater excommunication.

Schnitzer is a Modernist of the radical and destructive type. His reasoning by some might be considered conclusive. He admits that the Roman Church has the greatest interest in proving the divine origin of the papacy. On this depends the claim of the papacy in the Middle Ages for universal dominion and her modern claim of infallibility. If the pope is not the follower of Saint Peter in the See of Rome, and if the alleged privileges granted by Christ to Peter have not been inherited by Peter's successors, the whole edifice, says Schnitzer, falls to the ground like a house built of cards. Rome has not only developed its own philosophy, but also its own history. The author says this is absolutely necessary, and likewise necessary has it been to remove this philosophy and this history from the realm of criticism. The greatest question in connection with this criticism is: Will this philosophy and this history bear examination? He comes to the logical

GERMANY

conclusion that it will not. For the scientific investigator tradition, as such, has no aureole around its head. If dogma disagrees, so much the worse for dogma; for history must correct dogma. According to Schnitzer the Catholic Church has raised a fence around it, and on the fence is this notice, "Do not touch me." But the true historian is not frightened by this. He does not permit himself to be throttled by the theologian.

"It is not my purpose merely to keep myself in harmony with the Church; my duty is to keep myself in harmony with the truth. And if I am in harmony with the truth I am in harmony with the Church, if she is in possession of the truth. If she is not, if she stands in fear of the truth, if she flies from recognized scientific conclusions, so much the worse for her. In this case she can not be considered. Does God require or stand in need of lies?" This is certainly a noble passage among others in this book, which shows the spirit in which Schnitzer approaches this important question. He further treats it from the viewpoint of literature, eschatology, Biblical criticism, and the history of the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Christian Church. After a very thorough and minute examination of all the sources of information available to the modern scholar he concludes that Jesus did not establish the papacy, that He did not even think of such an establishment. Christ's thoughts were bent on a coming world-catastrophe. Not in the remotest degree did the future of the Church engage His attention. This last assertion of Schnitzer, however, will undoubtedly be questioned by conservative scholarship.

Coming to the words according to Matthew 16: 18, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," he considers them as uncanonical, and says that they crept into the Gospel manuscripts in the second or third century (???). They were unknown to the early Church, and even if mentioned as the traditional utterances of our Lord, they did not bear the interpretation ultimately given to them. Schnitzer says these words were the beginning of those monstrous fabrications which were used to support the mad claims of the mediæval popes to dominate the world. Among the Roman clerics of Ger-

GERMANY

many this bold utterance was plainly understood, and there is much searching of hearts and vowing of vengeance. Yet the march of truth can not be halted, and even if Rome once more brings Professor Schnitzer to his knees, he has succeeded in the great search for truth, as is plainly shown in the case of the German professors and the anti-Modernist oath, which shall be treated in a later chapter of this book.

Another Romanist heretic is found in the eminent professor of Theology, Dr. Hugo Koch, of the Catholic Divinity School at Braunsberg. He also has fallen a victim to the persecuting zeal of the anti-Modernist school in the Church of Rome. Koch has been forced to relinquish his post on the teaching staff of this institution and to retire into private life. He is considered as one of the greatest authorities on the history of the Church in the first three centuries after Christ, and his writings in Germany and elsewhere enjoy a reputation second only in extent to those of Harnack and Gunkel. A similar question to the one propounded by Schnitzer, in thorough treatment with con-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

clusive reasoning and convincing logic, brought the ire of the Vatican with its Italian and Spanish advisers down upon him. The immediate cause of the trouble was a study, published by the professor, entitled “Cyprian und der Römische Primat” (“Cyprian and the Roman Primate”). In this book Dr. Koch was at pains to show that Saint Cyprian, who was Bishop of Carthage and who died A. D. 258, was absolutely ignorant of any difference between the standing of the Bishop of Rome and that of any other bishop, and that at that time there was no notion entertained among churchmen either of a papacy or of a doctrine of infallibility. Dr. Koch laid it down as an historical fact that up to the time of Cyprian’s death there was no question of any general subjection to the Roman See, and that such an idea would have been absolutely repellent to such a powerful churchman as Saint Cyprian.

Dr. Koch reasons in this fashion: The doctrine that Jesus founded the papacy when He said to Peter, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,” is directly contradicted by the facts of history. The

GERMANY

dogma that this saying of Christ's meant the rule and dominance of the Bishop of Rome, and that the powers of this bishop were directly received from Peter in accordance with the spirit and letter of this saying, is a doctrine, says Koch, for which not the shadow of a shade of evidence is forthcoming. Jesus founded nothing in the sense in which the modern Roman Catholic Church uses this word. Koch will not agree with the Roman doctors when they say that the papacy was founded by Christ, nor will he consent to Luther's assertion that the papacy was founded by the devil. And the remark, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," has about as much to do with the foundation of the papacy as the phrase, also addressed to Peter, "Get thee behind Me, Satan; thou art a stumbling block unto Me," has to do with the French Revolution. "As a matter of fact," says Koch, "the child has quite another father."

Dr. Koch knew quite well the consequences that would befall him after his progressive attitude. Very nobly he says in the foreword to his book, "He who openly says

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

that which he believes after years of earnest seeking and toil in the face of history will escape the most fearful of all anathemas, the anathema of insulted truth and a tortured conscience.” Quietly and voluntarily Koch resigned his position in Braunsberg, and now lives in private life. He is a Württemberger, and, had he remained “orthodox,” would undoubtedly have been appointed to a high position at Tübingen.

The German Catholic press points out to its readers that it was nothing less than an imperative and inevitable duty on the part of the Holy Father to enter upon the warfare against Modernism, which he is conducting so energetically. Although the action was prompted by the developments in Italy and France mostly, yet we hardly believe that the *Kölner Volkszeitung* is quite right when it says, “We are glad to be able to say that there is nothing like this in Germany.” Of course, Germany is not a Catholic nation in the sense in which this can be said of Italy, nor does there stand at the head of the Modernist movement in Germany as radical a

GERMANY

man as Loisy in France; but let us not forget that conditions, as they have developed in regard to the anti-Modernist oath, will sooner or later bring out the spirit of the Teuton, as in the days of the great reformer, Dr. Martin Luther.

V
ENGLAND

ENGLISH Catholicism of the nineteenth century has received its best strength and talents, its real life, from Protestantism. Ever since the year 1833 has the movement of Tractarianism brought large numbers of converts from Protestantism into the Catholic fold. Among them were not a few members of the nobility, men of science, and even clerics of the Anglican Church. They believed that the Christian doctrine had a more genuine exemplification within the Catholic Church than within Protestant denominations; yet these men were considerably less attracted by the Catholic theology and dogma than by the Church ceremonies and the papal claim of apostolic succession.

The father of Tractarianism is found in Edward Bouverie Pusey, (born 1800; died 1882). He was the second son of the first Viscount Folkestone, Jacob Bouverie, de-

ENGLAND

scending from the old Huguenot family of Bouverie. At the age of eighteen he entered Christ Church College, Oxford, and in 1824 was elected fellow at Oriel College, where he became intimately acquainted with J. H. Newman and John Keble. In 1828 he had attracted the attention of academic circles to such a degree that the Duke of Wellington in 1829 made him regius professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. In 1833 his "Tracts for the Times" had begun to appear and caused a great sensation. In these "Tracts" was promulgated the Anglican doctrinal and religious system, known as "Tractarianism." The principles of this movement are known as the Oxford Movement, and afterwards as the Catholic or Anglo-Catholic Revival. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century the principles of the Church of England were maintained with little zeal, and public worship and church edifices evidenced laxity and neglect. The first marked sign of a reaction was the appearance of John Keble's "Christian Year," and its phenomenal popularity. The publication of the "Tracts for the Times," pre-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

pared by different authors, began September 9, 1833. The first sixty-six tracts were short papers, some original, but mostly extracts from eminent English writers, especially of the seventeenth century, and from Ante-Nicene Fathers. The points especially insisted upon by the Tractarians in addition to apostolic succession (the grace of the sacraments, and therefore belief in baptismal regeneration, the Real Presence of the Eucharist, and the power of the keys in absolution) were regarded by many as Romish. The entry of J. H. Newman into the Roman Catholic Church in 1845 intensified the feelings against the Tractarians, but the two greatest leaders, E. B. Pusey and John Keble, remained Anglicans. The Anglo-Catholic Revival since 1845 has assumed a more and more practical character in the institution of guilds, religious sisterhoods and brotherhoods, and parochial missions, improvement of church music, introduction or revival of hymns and popular devotions, restoration and building of churches. The principal phases of the Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic movement have reproduced themselves to a

ENGLAND

large extent in the Episcopal Church of the United States.

E. B. Pusey in 1834 joined the forces of High-Churchism, which after that formed the purpose and task of his life. He exercised a great and decisive influence upon the character and events of the movement, but was not responsible for the foundation of the new party. He threw himself into the study of the Fathers and of those Anglicans who in the seventeenth century had not succeeded in realizing their idea that the “Old Church,” *i. e.*, the Mediæval Church, in spite of Roman deformations, had been the only true expression of the Church of Christ, and from these studies Pusey’s ideas of the Church received a decisive influence. In this he, together with Keble and Newman, edited, after 1836, the “Oxford Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West” (50 vols., Oxford, 1838-85). In a lecture on the “Book of Common Prayer” he asserted, long before Newman, that many genuinely Catholic doctrines might be upheld even with the acknowledgment of the Thirty-nine Articles. In 1843 Pusey, in

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

a sermon, stated views which, deviating from the conception of the sacrament current since the Reformation, closely approached the mediæval sacrificial idea of the Real Presence. In consequence he was deposed from his office as preacher. The news of the deposition created such a sensation that Pusey advanced to a leading position in the struggle of the Church, and the movement was characterized by the name of Puseyism.

Pusey was held in check in his sermons as well as in his theological investigation by a forced conservatism that strove to awaken forgotten ideals. As a polemical writer he possessed great gifts, but was not so profound in theology, as he lacked in consistence and keenness. He directed his eye to the past, therefore he could not comprehend the modern spirit. A natural consequence to a renewal of mediæval ceremonies in worship was his effort to harmonize with Rome and the renewal of the mediæval conception of the sacrament. He vigorously protested against such a renewal, yet he could not hinder the renewal of ceremonies from becoming the shibboleth of his party. Although he worked

ENGLAND

very keenly for the harmonizing of his Church and Catholicism, outwardly he always remained true to the Anglican Church.

Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, a robust personality and a prince in ecclesiastical matters, probably retained to himself more independence toward the Roman Church than any other bishop in the nineteenth century. He was born in 1808 at Totteridge; studied theology at the University of Oxford, and was appointed rector of Lavington and Graffham in Sussex, 1834, and Archdeacon of Chichester, 1840. At this period, and when he was two years selected preacher at Oxford, he published his "Unity of the Church," in which he ably defended the doctrine of Anglo-Catholicism. Previous to this time he had visited, in 1838, Rome and had seen Cardinal Wiseman, whose successor he became later, but he was still totally out of sympathy with Roman Catholicism. After the conversion of W. G. Ward and J. H. Newman to Roman Catholicism, Manning was left at the head of the High Church party in the Anglican Church.

Compelled by sickness, however, in 1847

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

he took a continental tour through Belgium and Germany to Italy, which lasted until July, 1848. Most of this time he spent in Rome. In April and May, 1848, he was received in audience by Pius IX. His doubts concerning the catholicity of the Anglican Church were meantime increasing, although there is no evidence that he seriously contemplated withdrawing from her communion. The consecration of the unorthodox Hampden to the See of Hereford and the decision in the famous Gorham case seemed to him evidence that the Church of England was not a part of the Church catholic. (Rev. G. C. Gorham, having views concerning baptismal regeneration which were highly Calvinistic, and not in accord with those of the Church of England, was refused to be instituted by the Bishop of Exeter in 1847. Gorham took the case into the Court of Arches, which sustained the bishop in 1849; he then appealed from the decision of the spiritual court to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, which rendered a decision in Gorham's favor in 1850.)

Manning resigned his archdeaconry in

ENGLAND

1850, went to London, and there placed himself under the instruction of the Jesuits, and on Passion Sunday, April 6, 1851, was received into the Roman Catholic Church. On the following Sunday he received minor orders, and was ordained priest on June 14th. After residing for several years in Rome, where he spent three years in study at the Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici, receiving his doctorate from the pope in 1854, he began regular work in England. With unceasing activity in preaching and writing, he also labored among the poor. When in 1865 Cardinal Wiseman died, the pope ignored the names submitted to him by the chapter, nominating Manning as Wiseman's successor as Archbishop of Westminster, London. A rigid disciplinarian, he spared neither himself nor others, and worked consistently in an ultramontane spirit to advance Roman Catholicism in England. He founded the Roman Catholic University of Kensington in 1874; this was an unsuccessful attempt, for this institution remained open only from 1874 to 1878. More success, however, was attained by him in the promotion of parochial schools.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

He gained additional prominence in 1870, as he took a very active part in the Council of the Vatican, defending the dogma of the infallibility of the pope.

On March 15, 1875, he was created a cardinal, receiving the hat December 31, 1877, when he was in Rome. When attending the conclave, after the death of Pius IX, February 7, 1878, although some of the Italian cardinals were prepared to vote for him as pope, he cast his ballot for Cardinal Pecci (Leo XIII). With the new pope he was less in sympathy, and so for the remainder of his life his chief interests were social questions, especially total abstinence, for the advancement of which he founded a "League of the Cross," which in 1874 already had numbered in London alone some thirty thousand members. He was likewise extremely active in the cause of labor, and his urgent advocacy of the claims of the working classes drew upon him the charge of Socialism, although he rightly denied the truth of the assertion. In 1889 he assisted in settling the strike of the longshoremen, while he was also active in movement for the suppression of

ENGLAND

the East African slave-trade and Hindu child-marriage, in addition to advocating the raising of the minimum age for child-labor.

Cardinal Manning was a Christian Socialist, public-spirited, broad in his sympathies, and a friend of the laboring classes. As an independent cleric he criticised repeatedly with severe words the church-politics of the Vatican. In the nine "Hindrances" (published by his biographer, E. C. Purcell, 2 volumes, London, 1895), which were in the way of extending the cause of Catholicism in England, Cardinal Manning accuses the Church of Rome most severely for the disintegrating influence of the Jesuits, the alienation of ritualism, the intellectual inferiority, the spiritual and social separation of the Catholics from Protestants. These were the same conditions in England, which were profoundly and keenly felt by the Reform-Catholics in Germany. Herman Schell repeatedly for the defense of his position referred the Vatican authorities to Manning's "Hindrances," for they even excelled Schell's writings on reform within the Roman Church. Manning was a prolific writer, and

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

his works reveal a man of sincere conviction, earnest faith, and noble character. He was pre-eminently an ecclesiastic and a diplomat. The most prominent of his writings are: "The True Story of the Vatican Council," "Independence of the Holy See," "Four Great Evils of the Day," "The Temporal Power of the Pope," "England and Christendom," "The Church and Modern Society," etc. Manning had been too long in the fold of the Protestant Church; he had been too closely connected with the Church of his youth; consequently the spirit of the Reformation remained to a great extent within his heart. This is especially noticeable in his later years, in his keen reaction against Catholic Ultramontanism.

Cardinal John Henry Newman (born 1801 and died 1890) is not an ecclesiastic simply, but a theologian with a fine and profound spirit. When he refers to the Christianity of the New Testament as the immortal and practical ideal, when he finds in one's personal experience and in one's testimony of the conscience the last instance for the proof of Christianity, when he grants to the con-

ENGLAND

science of the individual under certain circumstances the right to disregard even some decrees of the pope, we find here memories of the Christianity under whose light he had been reared and under whose shadows he grew to manhood. The name of this eminent Englishman must be mentioned in connection with English Modernism. It is, however, impossible to mention Newman's name without reverence and regret—the name of the man who wrote in June, 1833, while traveling in an orange-boat from Palermo to Marseilles, the famous verses, "Lead, kindly Light." He was born free. Oh, that he had but been able to retain his birthright; but he forfeited it to his own loss and that of many others.

Newman was in no sense a Modernist. He accepted the papacy because it was an essential part of his conception of the Church: to be a Catholic, in the sense in which he understood the word, without the pope was, he saw, a contradiction in terms. But no Modernist was ever more alive to the weak points in the theory of Catholicism or to the defective working of its practical system than he. He may be regarded as the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Father of Modernism in this sense, that he gave currency to certain root-ideas of the movement. His theory of the development of Christian doctrine, applied on a restricted field, accounted for the differences between the ancient and the mediæval Church; taken largely, it involved an outlook over religion and history which he could no doubt have repudiated, but which, equally without doubt, owes its diffusion to him. Professor Karl Holl says: "In spite of certain and not unessential differences, although it is doubted by interested parties, one fact remains—Cardinal Newman is the father of English Modernism. No one has exerted such an influence upon the men who are to-day at the head of the Modernist movement in England as he."

With Keble and Pusey, Newman was associated in the "Oxford Movement." As Dean Church says, "Keble gave the inspiration, and Newman did the work." In 1838 he published "Lectures on Justification," also his tract on "Antichrist." These publications were largely responsible for the formation of a school of opinion, which eventually came into collision with the nation and

ENGLAND

the nation's Church. At about this time Newman became editor of the *British Critic*, which was used as the chief organ of Tractarianism. His influence was already wide. During the years in which the Tractarian movement held sway Newman wrote twenty-four tracts. The famous "Tract 90" he wrote in 1841, the outcome of which was that the movement came under the ban, and Newman's position was no longer tenable. When he wrote his "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine" (1845), his doubts respecting the Roman Catholic Church gradually vanished, and he was received into that Church on October 9, 1845. This event was of far-reaching importance to the Church of England and brought about the end of the Oxford Movement. In October, 1846, he went to Rome, where he was ordained priest and received the doctorate. He became a very important factor in 1850, when the Roman hierarchy of England was restored, also called the Papal Aggression. This move produced a violent anti-Catholic agitation. In reply to an adverse criticism made by Charles Kingsley in 1864, Newman issued his

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

“*Apologia pro Vita Sua*,” a work which has been regarded a triumphant vindication of his integrity and honesty of purpose throughout his life.

Dr. Johannes Kübel, author of “*Geschichte des katholischen Modernismus*,” writes the following words concerning the work of Newman: “A few years before his conversion to Catholicism he sought in vain the genuine holiness and the fruits of regeneration in the Roman Church; and in his last years he confessed to a friend he would never have found the courage to affiliate with the Papal Church had he really known the Catholic Church from within. In spite of this fact he remained a Catholic; for in Catholicism he saw the only possibility to flee from skepticism. He could not believe in God without believing in the Church. But practical Catholicism disappointed him as it had disappointed Manning and the other great English converts. ‘In the vicinity of Peter’s Rock rages malaria,’ Newman wrote at times. It has been characteristic that Newman retained the independence of theological thinking in the second half of his Catholic life.

ENGLAND

Whoever has absorbed through forty years of his life modern culture and civilization will not become a scholastic in spite of his conversion.” When the pope in 1907 delivered his encyclical against Modernism, which is known as the *Syllabus of 1907*, there is no doubt that some propositions had been aimed at the teachings of Newman, not at Loisy alone. Newman had actually influenced Loisy and other historians of the dogma. Of course, to reject Newman would simply mean for the Roman Church to reject one of the greatest men in Anglo-Catholicism. Yet that had been done by the Papal Church before. Prophets have been killed and their graves decorated. The best services of her great sons have often been placed under the ban.

The case of Abby Loisy, who had disclaimed a speculative philosophy, was extensively discussed in 1904 in Anglican and Anglo-Catholic circles. The alliance between the French Modernists and the English Modernists—or, as they had been called, based upon Newman’s work, “advanced Catholics,” also “progressive Catholics”—this alliance had been brought about by Freiherr Fried-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

rich von Flügel, a friend of Loisy. He came from an Austrian family of nobility; by family relations, however, he became a British citizen. *The Pilot*, as the organ of Anglican orthodoxy, *The Hibbert Journal*, also *The Times*, published articles for and against Loisy. H. C. Corrane, a leader among English Modernists, explained the orthodox Protestant, the liberal Protestant, and the modern Catholic historical position in such a manner that he claims it is really not a question of historical criticism, nor a question of diverse establishment, but a question of several religio-philosophical theories. The facts are the same always; only, orthodox Protestantism sees in history here the work of God and there the work of the devil; liberal Protestantism differentiates between divine origin and the continuous work of man; true Catholicism considers the whole development in Church history as only the work of God: this latter point then justifies the Catholic dogma.

The noblest personality and unquestionably the leader of the Modernistic movement in England was a member of the Jesuit or-

ENGLAND

der, Father George Tyrrell. Professor Karl Holl says, "In Father Tyrrell the religious motive is found at its strongest and purest." His case is somewhat different from those already mentioned, for his variation from the official teaching can not be so definitely determined as in the case of Loisy. Father Tyrrell's books, published with the official sanction, were of a popular religious character, and although they were obviously incompatible with the strict scholastic system, they were published with the official sanction of the Church authorities. The immediate cause of the excommunication of Father Tyrrell was a personal letter, afterward printed under the title of "A Much Abused Letter," written to an Italian professor to urge him to remain in the Roman communion, even if many items in teaching and practice of the Church seemed contrary to his convictions and distasteful to his feelings. It was plain here that Father Tyrrell's point of view was not that of his correspondent; apparently, therefore, Tyrrell's condemnation was brought upon him because he spoke in a slighting way of the administration of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the Church and failed to hold that scholasticism was absolutely involved in the Roman Catholic system of belief. Unconsciously he lived on his Protestant inheritance. He studied in the school of Augustine and Thomas à Kempis, in order to absorb the evangelical elements.

George Tyrrell grew up as a boy in Dublin, receiving the major part of his education in Trinity College, Dublin. After his graduation he felt the attraction of the Roman Catholic Church to such a degree that he took the vows of the Jesuit order. He was an Irishman in every fiber of his nature, with Irish wit, impulsiveness, and large-hearted generosity of temper and of affections. In regard to religion, however—for it was with that central subject that the intellect, or rather the whole nature, of the youth, George Tyrrell, came keenly to concern itself—in the Dublin of that time, as indeed in Ireland generally, every one belonged to one of two opposing camps, the Catholic or the Protestant. The Puritan and the anti-Catholic sentiment, once so prevalent, is now not so keenly felt, owing to certain circum-

ENGLAND

stances; the first of these is the wide extension through the length and breadth of the modern Church of England of the ideals and influence of the Oxford Movement. The second is the existence of a widespread mass of indifference to all organized religion, especially among the working classes in great centers of population. George Tyrrell's secession from the Protestant garrison to the opposing Catholic camp needed a good deal of quiet and lonely courage. Among the main elements in Tyrrell's spiritual and intellectual equipment, however, was the influence of Newman's writings. For a great part of his career, at least, he was as far as was possible for so original a thinker a disciple of the Newman school; yes, more than that, a teacher and an evangelist for Newman's principles. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Tyrrell was the most striking personality among the followers of Newman, certainly of those who became so after the cardinal's retirement.

The great cardinal was not a Modernist in the sense of many others, except in his methods. And yet from the "Grammar of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Assent," that fruitful seed-plot of neo-Catholic Pragmatism, Tyrrell learned the necessity of appealing to the whole man, to the emotional and volitional as well as to the intellectual elements of his complex being, if the man is to be brought into allegiance to truth, and is to steer his course aright as his spirit goes sounding on his dim and perilous way. From the "Essay on Development of Christian Doctrine" he learned that looking backward is but a pathetic fallacy, unless it be to see in Scripture the principles revealed in the first dawn of Christianity which are to guide it to its goal. Tyrrell learned also that, in Newman's words, "to grow is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often."

For twelve years Father Tyrrell was recognized as one of the most daring and brilliant of the Jesuit writers. In 1906 he published in an English paper an article which was rejected by his superiors in the society as extremely heretical. He promulgated theories of hell and punishment after death which were contrary to the doctrines of Roman Catholicism, and brought down

ENGLAND

upon his head heavy storms of ecclesiastical criticism. In the same article he expressed some sympathy with the opinions put forward by the scientist, Saint George Mivart, who had some years previously been excommunicated by Cardinal Vaughn. When ordered by the authorities to recant his heresy he refused, but afterward withdrew from the order.

He appeared on the battleground as a leader of the Modernist movement in 1904, the year which is filled at first with M. Loisy's troubles, and throughout with Father Tyrrell's. For M. Loisy, after Rome's rejection of three successive forms of submission and non-acknowledgment of the fourth declaration, abandoned in March his Sorbonne lectureship and retired to live in the country. Beginning with January, Father Tyrrell circulated, amongst those who required this information, his anonymous "Letter to a Professor of Anthropology," a brochure which was destined to bring him the second-greatest of his trials; in January and February appeared, or were simply printed, his articles "Semper Eadem," that caused

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

much commotion. In the same year appeared his book "Lex Orandi," which revealed the differences between him and traditional Catholicism. So May 2, 1904, he wrote to his intimate friend, Friedrich von Flügel, "I have no sympathy with virulent anti-clericalism and scandal-mongering, but I feel more and more, with Lord Acton, that the principle of Ultramontanism is profoundly immoral and un-Christian." At the end of August and the beginning of September, 1904, he addressed a request to be secularized to the general of the Jesuit order, also a full statement of his views concerning the official ideas and policy of this order. His sincerity is seen after receiving the answer from the general (he did not like his position, for the general said nothing about taking any steps for Father Tyrrell's secularization), when on October 11th he wrote to his friend, von Flügel: "I do not see how I could with self-respect have done less than I have done. I am resolute that there shall be no sign of bitterness or of ungenerosity. I have numberless dear Jesuit friends whose least hair I would not harm." Throughout 1905 the

ENGLAND

negotiations for his leaving the order and finding a bishop to receive him proceeded very slowly, with difficulties, but with little or no bitterness on either side. On February 20, 1906, the *Daily Chronicle* published a dignified letter from Father Tyrrell, saying, "The conflict, such as it is, is one of opinion and tendencies, not of persons; it is the result of mental and moral necessities, created by the antithesis with which the Church is wrestling in this period of transition." He was then outside his former order, and he was still without a bishop to give him an ecclesiastical status. These privileges, formerly considered so important by him, he never regained.

The break between him and the Church occurred in 1906. George Mivart, professor of Anthropology, complained to Father Tyrrell about the incompatibility of his own scientific conclusions with Catholic belief. Tyrrell sought to reconcile the professor in a letter, and consequently made certain statements very friendly to modern scientific research. His troubles with the general of the Order of the Jesuits came to a head by the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

appearance in the *Corriere della Sera*, a Milanese newspaper, of an unauthorized Italian translation of part of his "Letter to a Professor of Anthropology," with the divulgence of the letter's authorship. Archbishop Ferrari, of Milan, informed the Jesuit general, and Tyrrell was then expelled from the order. This confidential "Letter to a Professor," where he endeavored to persuade his friend to remain in the fold of the Roman Catholic Church even if he could not countenance the extravagant interpretation of the Catholic claims, was put on the Index of books not to be read by good Catholics. In "A Much Abused Letter" Father Tyrrell prints the letter itself with the facts of the incident and his own explanation.

In 1907 Father Tyrrell published an article in *Il Rinnovamento* under the title "From God or from Man?" a keen treatise against "Sacerdotalism," the bureaucracy and red-tapeism of the priests, especially against the absolute exaggeration of the pope-thought, an exaggeration which has shown great power since the Vatican Council. The Church should be there for the pope, and

ENGLAND

not the pope for the Church. The article closed with the vision of the time when the Church will return to the deep-Christian and deep-Catholic idea of the democratic character of all authority and freedom with which Christ has liberated humanity. The year 1907 brought the culmination of the troubles. In May, Cardinals Steinhuber and Ferrari censured and prohibited *Il Rinnovamento* in the pope's name, and excommunicated the editors. In July the Holy Office's decree "Lamentabili Sane" condemned sixty-five propositions, mostly of a directly historico-critical kind.

At the same time many of Tyrrell's friends, among them chiefly de la Fourrière of Storrington, worked for Father Tyrrell's rehabilitation. The pope permitted him to celebrate the mass; of course, under the exorbitant condition "not to hold epistolary correspondence without the previous approbation of a competent person designated by the bishop." Father Tyrrell refused to accept the condition; he would not ask his nearest friend to share the responsibility of an action that was all his own, although he

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

had accepted the clause of ordinary correspondence, even though on religious topics.

In his book "Through Scylla and Charybdis, or the Old Theology and the New," he gives a vivid account of his theological and religious development. His aim had been to liberate religion from every theological and dogmatic bond. According to Loisy's statement, the theologians of the encyclical had found most of their material in Tyrrell's book. Later he wrote to a friend: "Looking back, our mistake has been our zeal to help the disturbed intelligence of the minority to hold on to the Church. Our 'synthesis' raised theological difficulties in solving historical, and the officials have fastened on the former and have ignored the latter." He also admitted that his "Lex Orandi" and Loisy's "L'Evangile et L'Eglise" were written for needs that Rome has never felt. Tyrrell made advances to the Old Catholics shortly before his death, which occurred July 19, 1909.

Tyrrell's "Mediævalism," the final burning of his bridge, is a book which lives from start to finish. It is the Modernist's declara-

ENGLAND

tion of war against the Ultramontanism which exploits Catholicism and which justifies the saying of the German philosopher, Baader, uttered years ago, that "Catholicism is the strength of popery, while popery is the weakness of Catholicism." The deepest and most characteristic of his books, written shortly before his death, was undoubtedly "Christianity at the Cross-Roads." Here he showed that he was increasingly conscious of the mistake of Liberal Protestantism, and refused to accept its one-sided attempt at solution of the religious problem. He never parted with the view that, however apparently startling the incidental changes in the course of its long development, Catholic Christianity is one organism, fundamentally the same, whether in its earlier and rudimentary or its later and more articulated condition.

Father Tyrell in the last months of his life lived near the ancestral home of Miss Maud Petre, and she became a confidential friend of the excommunicated Modernist. Miss Petre is a member of a prominent English family which for many generations has

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

been conspicuously devoted to the Roman Catholic faith, and she herself continues very loyal to the traditions of her fathers. Unexpectedly she was made the target of a very sudden persecution directed from the Vatican at Rome. The courage with which the little woman has resisted the dragooning provokes great admiration. On account of having become a confidential friend of the excommunicated Modernist solely, and without other word or act of her own to justify the suspicion, she was marked by bigoted cardinals at Rome as a probable heretic, and twice the demand has been made of her, in order to clear herself of this suspicion, that she must certify over her own signature that she accepts to the letter the encyclical and decree in which three years ago the present pope denounced Modernism as a mortal sin and commanded all Catholics to renounce it. The first demand was that she should send her declaration in this matter to the Vatican. She replied that if her life did not testify to her faith, her signature would be entirely in vain. This brought out, after some months, the second demand that, as a con-

ENGLAND

dition of receiving the sacraments in her Church, she must publish in the public press the affirmation that she accepted the pope's encyclical. To this she made answer again that she could undertake such a solemn action only if she were assured by the pope himself that his pronouncement on Modernism is as much a part of the infallible faith as the Apostles' Creed. This aftermath shows the spirit of the Vatican that is yet prevalent against the Modernist Tyrrell.

The articles of the great English Modernist were condemned by the Holy Office. He was deprived by the pope in 1907 of the right to administer the sacraments. Boldly he answered by a criticism of the papal encyclical on "Modernism," stating that it was directed against him and his friends; that it was not pastoral but polemic and argumentative. He said "the bishops would obey, but eventually Modernism would progress with redoubled vigor, like a river which, having been damned up for a time, was set free from its barriers." Father Tyrrell did not recant, and so could not be absolved nor buried in consecrated ground.

VI

AUSTRIA

AUSTRIA is essentially a Roman Catholic nation where the problem of Modernism is not so much a problem touching the historicocritical and theological side of the question, as seen in France or England, but rather the practical side of it. The cry in past years has been for practical reform. Before mention of two theologians can be made, however, we must consider a movement within the Roman Church of Austria which has grown to such an extent that from the year 1898 to December 31, 1910, the official figures show that 60,744 persons left the papal Church and affiliated themselves with evangelical Church bodies. This movement is known as the “*Los von Rom Bewegung*;” *i. e.*, Away from Rome, or Free from Rome Movement.

This is one of the most interesting features of recent religious life. It has taken place during the past half century. In the

AUSTRIA

beginning of the nineteenth century it seemed to be unquestioned that the bounds of Protestantism and Romanism were finally settled, and that a new reformation was not to be looked for. But the middle of the century saw a great intellectual, political, and religious awakening, which was destined to have unexpected results in the ecclesiastical world. It became impossible to maintain the persecuting laws against Protestants which characterized all Roman Catholic countries, and these laws gradually disappeared or were mitigated, and Protestant mission work began. These missions have been carried on with varying success, partly by small native Protestant Churches, partly by missionary societies of England, America, and Germany. But the movement away from Rome has not been due entirely or mainly to these missionary efforts; it has been due to movements of various kinds within the Church of Rome herself.

The middle of the last century was characterized in political matters by a fierce struggle between absolutism and democracy. We find that in the ecclesiastical world also

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

a similar struggle has taken place between Ultramontanism and the desire for greater freedom. The growth of political liberty made men dissatisfied with the despotism of the Vatican. In the political world democracy triumphed, but in the ecclesiastical Ultramontanism won the day, and the result of its victory was the Vatican Council and the Decree of Papal Infallibility. Some of the bishops who fought in the Council against the decree, with Döllinger at the head, launched the Old Catholic Church. This organization, however, in its friendship for Protestantism, has drawn more and more away from the characteristic doctrines of Romanism, and in some places it now serves as a temporary spiritual resting-place for those who are discontended with Rome, but not yet prepared for the decisive step of adopting a thoroughly evangelical Protestantism.

A movement away from Rome which was at first promising, but in the end proved more or less abortive, was that known as German Catholicism (Deutschkatholizismus). It was a reform movement which arose within the Roman Catholic Church in Germany in

AUSTRIA

the middle of the nineteenth century, and which also led to the formation of separate congregations. The immediate occasion was the solemn exhibition of what purported to be the seamless coat of Christ by Bishop Arnoldi in Treves in 1844. This was intended to demonstrate that the Roman Catholic population rendered unconditional obedience to the leadership of their clergy. Johannes Ronge, a young priest, thirty-one years old, published an open letter to Bishop Arnoldi as a trenchant protest against the "idolatrous celebration." In this letter the contradiction between the veneration of relics and the spirit of true Christianity is sharply emphasized. Ronge refused to retract this open letter, was excommunicated and degraded, left the Roman Church, but continued the literary controversy in a series of pamphlets, in which he demanded the abolition of celibacy, of auricular confession, and of Latin as the ecclesiastical language, and called for the formation of the German Catholic Church. Another priest, Johann Czerski, had already put these thoughts into practice. Ronge modernized the Apostles' Creed as

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

follows: "I believe in God, the Father, who through His almighty word created the world and rules it in wisdom, righteousness, and love. I believe in Jesus Christ, our Savior, who by His teachings, His life, and His death has ransomed us from the bondage of sin. I believe in the sway (Walten) of the Holy Ghost on earth. I believe in a holy, universal Christian Church, the communion of the faithful, the forgiveness of sins, and an eternal life." At the same time the congregations proclaimed the principle of complete freedom of conscience and the freedom of scientific investigation. Ronge began his agitation by making journeys throughout Germany, and it seemed as if a great day was dawning for German Catholicism. In 1847 there were already two hundred and fifty-nine congregations with eighty-eight ministers. The movement attracted notice even in foreign countries. But finally both men, Ronge and Czerski, from objecting to compulsory dogmas went on apace to thrusting all dogmas aside, and so a breach with the Christian faith resulted.

At the start German Catholicism was not

AUSTRIA

without certain prospects, for it voiced demands and represented ideas which corresponded to the mood of the times and contained much that was good. But that which Ronge and Czerski lacked was that wherein the entire movement was deficient: the power to proceed from negative criticism of the faults of the Roman Church to the formation of a purer Catholic Church. This impotence was rooted in the lack of religious productivity. The German Catholic movement brought forth not a single personality able to lead others as a prophet. Though it may also be granted that persecution by the civil power was not without influence on the decline of the movement, nevertheless in the last analysis the decisive reasons for failure were in its own make-up.

Now the remains of this once promising movement are associated with the Union of Free Religious Congregations. The German-speaking Roman Catholics, originally furnishing the greater part of these congregations, have recently given birth to a movement much more important, as already mentioned: the “*Los von Rom*” movement in

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Austria. For a long time there has been a considerable alienation of both the German and Slav inhabitants of Austria from the Church of Rome and its services; but whether this would have led to a movement toward Protestantism, and what form such a movement might have taken, it is difficult to conjecture. The actual initiation of the movement toward Protestantism was due to a combination of racial and political influences. The war of 1866 with Prussia had transferred the leadership of the German States to that State, and eventually, after the defeat of France, had led to the formation of the German Empire, from which Austria was excluded. This loss of political position and power was keenly felt by the Austrian Germans, who saw themselves displaced by a new Protestant power from the position they had occupied for ages, and the explanation that forced itself on many minds was that Romanism had sapped the vigor of their race. Their resentment against Rome was intensified by the attitude Rome assumed in the racial struggles between Germans and Slavs. Having found France an ineffectual instru-

AUSTRIA

ment for the promotion of its political claims, the Vatican began to throw its influence on the side of the Slavs, against the Germans, in order to build up a strong Slav Catholic power on which it could depend. Bitter anti-Roman political feeling was excited by this, and at length, on November 5, 1898, Schönerer, the leader of the German National party, made an appeal for a secession from Rome, issuing the watchword by which it has been known since, "Los von Rom." The movement has been pronounced purely a political maneuver, but this misrepresents its character entirely.

There existed at the time in Austria a pronounced religious dissatisfaction, out of which the possibility of the political movement arose. Even at the beginning many came out under the cover of the political passion of the moment whose impelling motive was religious. After two or three years the political element began rapidly to recede into the background, and finally became entirely subordinate, till eventually it almost disappeared. The secessions have taken place almost entirely from the German-speaking

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

portions of the population. Those who are most familiar with the Czech portions of Bohemia consider that the conditions exist for an important movement from Rome, but for the present the priests have succeeded in utilizing the strong racial hatred to prevent it by teaching their flocks that Protestantism is a German religion, and to become Protestants is to be Germanized. The converts have joined one or the other of the two Protestant confessions recognized by the government: the Augsburg or the Helvetic, mainly the former. Besides these many have joined the Old Catholics. According to the latest statistics the Old Catholic Church has had, since 1898, 16,571 accessions from Rome in Austria. A large number also worship in other Protestant Churches who are prevented by fear of persecution from publicly enrolling themselves as Protestants. The conversions to Protestantism have during the past few years remained steadily about 4,500 annually, the year 1910 numbering a larger number than 1909, or exceeding it by 813 persons. The movement shows no sign of abating yet. We give below a table of official

AUSTRIA

figures as furnished by the secretary on Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Empire of Austria, showing accurately this annual deflection from Rome:

1898..1,598	1903..4,510	1908...4,585
1899..6,385	1904..4,362	1909...4,377
1900..5,058	1905..4,855	1910...5,190
1901..6,639	1906..4,364	
1902..4,624	1907..4,197	Total...60,744

So these two Churches alone have gained from Rome, since the autumn of 1898—a little more than eleven years—77,315. And these numbers, important as they are, are only a slight indication of the gain the movement has brought both to the Protestants and the Old Catholics of Austria.

There is not space to follow the movement in detail through the different Roman Catholic countries. Little Belgium even has a vigorous and growing Mission Church, almost exclusively composed of converts from Romanism and their children. Mixed marriages, which at one time used to result almost invariably in gains to the Church of Rome in Germany and Austria, now generally mean gains to Protestantism. The losses

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

in Germany from this cause alone for recent years have been estimated by a Roman Catholic authority at over one hundred thousand, and the entire losses for the nineteenth century as at least a million. In France the revolt from Rome, though different in its nature, has been no less marked. The attitude of the Church of Rome toward the monasteries and the schools convinced the leading French statesmen that it was necessary to disestablish that Church, and an act for that purpose was carried in 1905. In Italy the last half century has seen a great revival of the Waldensian Church and the spreading of its organization and activities all over the peninsula, while the upheavals in Spain and Portugal are too fresh in our memory to need reporting here.

In the transformation from the political to the religious element a very profound influence has been exerted by the celebrated Austrian novelist, Peter Rosegger, who has shown deep interest in the movement, though remaining nominally a Roman Catholic. It had been his earnest intention to purify the Church of Rome. His celebrated book "Mein

AUSTRIA

"Himmelreich" contains his creed. This book was widely read. The chapter "Los von Rom" undoubtedly contained the general view of many of the dissenters. Rosegger honored the sacraments, believed the doctrine of the Roman Church in as far as it was in harmony with the gospel, honored the ritualism and the Church laws, but took, however, the Resurrection of Christ symbolically. But could and would not believe that the pope is infallible. Consequently he understood that the Bishop of Rome had neither divine nor other right to consider himself lord and master over all earthly potentates and peoples. "Why am I not allowed with my Alpine people to hear our mother tongue in the services? It is hard for the layman to understand, when the Catholic worship is conducted everywhere in a language understood by nobody. If Latin had only been the language of Christ, it might perhaps be different; there might be an excuse. But the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles so that they should preach to all creatures in their respective tongues. We can humbly adore the divine in religion, without under-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

standing it, but the human—that is the form, the ritualism—we desire to understand that. When the Church of Rome has become a matter of indifference to some, when others have entirely lost their confidence in her, and yet they still believe in Christianity as such, may they not affiliate with something higher that will lift them up morally and strengthen them spiritually, whether it is Protestantism or Old Catholicism?" Rosegger plainly described the conditions among the peasants of Styria in a vivid manner, the abuses of relics and ceremonies, the auricular confession, etc. If he took the Resurrection symbolically, he explained it was only for the reason that he could understand it better thus.

Albert Ehrhard, professor of Church History in Vienna, now at Strassburg, ventured in the fall of 1901 upon a rather daring undertaking when he published his book, "Catholicism and the Twentieth Century in the Light of Modern Ecclesiastical Developments" ("Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert im Lichte der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit"). It was the aim of this book to show by historical proof

AUSTRIA

that it is unjust to take the Middle Ages as the model period for all times. The value of mediæval developments is only relative; but an irresistible development has continued from those centuries to modern culture. This development was not simply the product of Protestantism, but rather neutral in relation to denominations. The attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church in the “*Los von Rom*” movement prompted Ehrhard to write this book. He is convinced that the imperfections and abuses within the Church of Rome, as shown in the practical life, must be remedied by the Vatican, yet he would not do that in public. In spite of this reluctance this book was a noteworthy attempt to reform the Church in Austria. It was later greatly regretted that such a scholarly man could be quieted by the Vatican.

“Reform-Catholicism, where are you?” asks, after Ehrhard’s and Schell’s futile attempts, the active and rather peculiar leader of the Christian Socialistic party, Prelate Schleicher. Reform work is being done by this party, of course, in the sense of Ultramontanism. Ehrhard says the theological

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

life of the Austrian clerics is of a rather low type. Seminaries for priests are more numerous than the theological faculties in universities. The facultes have the same ancient curriculum as the seminaries; it is their endeavor to give the minimum of theological education. In 1907 Ehrhard was requested by the authorities either to be silent or, should he continue in his reform effort against the Church of Rome, to stay within a certain prescript limit. He knew the limit too well; his serious mistake was not that he could be forced to keep silent, but that he ever attempted to reform.

A man coming in conflict with the pope's encyclical was Professor Ludwig Wahrmund, who delivered in February, 1908, in Innsbruck a profound lecture on "The Catholic View of the World and Liberal Science." This lecture was printed, and in a few months forty-four editions of the pamphlet were sold and distributed. Wahrmund never attempted to explain the essence of the philosophy of the Catholic Church; only the favorable circumstances of time under which the lecture was delivered was the cause of the excite-

AUSTRIA

ment. Quickly this professor was transferred from Innsbruck to Prague; yet it should justly be remembered that Wahr mund read law, and not theology, therefore clericalism had no right to transfer him from Innsbruck to Prague.

The theological training of the Catholic clergy is given partly by the faculties of the various universities and partly by the diocesan seminaries. The course given by the seminaries corresponds essentially to that given by the university faculties, but the seminaries are forbidden to confer academic decrees, and the bishop is in absolute control. Certain orders provide for the education of their own members in twenty monastic schools, yearly courses being given in successive years in different monasteries in Tyrol.

The increase made by Roman Catholics in the last decade of the nineteenth century was but 9.12 per cent, while the evangelicals of the Augsburg Confession showed an increase of 15.17 per cent during the same period, as against 9.28 made by them in the preceding decade. The Helvetian Confession

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

also made a gain of 6.67 per cent in that decade. In Bohemia alone the Evangelical gain was 20.06 per cent, in Styria 25.9 per cent, and in lower Austria 37.01 per cent. Only in Silesia and Galicia did the increase of Evangelicals fail to keep pace with the gain in population, this being due to the increasing emigration from the German districts of West Silesia and the German colonies in Galicia, an additional factor being the immigration of Galician workmen to Silesia to work in the coal mines.

In connection with the de-Romanizing process in Austria we must in this chapter refer to a similar movement among the Roman Catholic Poles of the western provinces of Russia. This movement is akin to the "Los von Rom" Bewegung. It is a revolt of the more intelligent of the Catholic population against the aggressive tactics of the Jesuits, a revolt which in some districts has been fanned into flame by the revelations of loose living among the clergy, revelations which have recently been made in several Polish bishoprics.

The new sect, which has assumed the name

AUSTRIA

of "Mariarites," finds favor in the eyes of the Russian authorities, probably for political reasons, for it has always been the policy of the Czar's government to exercise pressure on the Vatican by favoring every movement of revolt against the Roman Church. The "Mariarites" have now practically spread over the whole of Russian Poland in more or less loose communities, and are found as far north as the confines of Lithuania and as far south as the borders of the Ukraine. It is computed that the movement already numbers no less than five hundred thousand. While retaining some of the peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church—for example, the belief in the purgatory and in the power of the Virgin Mary—they have thrown overboard everything which gives the priests any sacrificial or sacerdotal authority. The belief in the Real Presence they regard as idolatrous. Equally explicit is their negation of the dogma of papal infallibility. In a recent pastoral by their bishop, Johann Kowalski, the following remarkable passage occurs, "The Kingdom of God is a kingdom of light, of love, and of peace; a kingdom

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

which gives all men liberty and equality in Christ.” Another significant passage gives the attitude which the new Church assumes towards the Bible. “One of our principal duties,” says the bishop in another letter to his clergy, “is the proclamation of the gospel. Our lives shall be as the mirror to Christ’s gospel. The gospel is our highest law, our light on the road of life. In every Mariarite house the gospel must find a place, and every member of the family must be versed in its contents.”

The Mariarites have established friendly relations with the Old Catholics of Holland, and their bishop, Johann Kowalski, has been consecrated by Bishop Gerhard Gul, the Old Catholic Bishop of Utrecht, on October 5, 1909. The new Church has little difficulty in obtaining money from its supporters. Its leaders are even thinking of establishing a mission to the heathen in the eastern provinces of Siberia.

VII

SPAIN

“WHY spill so much ink over Spain? Are there not nineteen million Catholics there to guard the Church?” asks a correspondent in the *Catholic Citizen* of September, 10, 1910. The matter is in the newspapers, and the Catholic press is now compelled to present the Catholic side of it; they must pay attention to and worry respecting the Spanish situation, realizing that their publicity is limited, and that the current of public opinion runs adversely to the Roman Church. They do find it exceedingly difficult to persuade the non-Catholic American public that the Vatican is right on this Spanish question, when the majority of Spanish dailies, and apparently the majority of the thinking and progressive Spanish people, are supporting the anti-papal view. Under the Jesuit yoke Spain, so little understood outside of its own borders, is earnestly struggling to be free.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Spain is evidently tired of being ruled by a venerable ecclesiastic on the banks of the Tiber who is entirely out of sympathy with the modern movement of society in politics, science, education, and theology. It is also a very restless nation.

The situation in Spain concerning Modernism is not the same as found in Italy or France, the other Latin countries on the continent. We do not find strong personalities like Salvatore Minocchi, Giovanni Gennocchi, Giovanni Semeria, or Romolo Murri, as we do in Italy; for leaders like Mgr. Duchesne and Alfred Loisy of France we look in vain. Yet in Spain, as in the other Latin countries, changes have taken place during the last few years that are almost startling; they are of fundamental significance. A third of a century ago, when Protestant missionaries first entered Spain, they found few friends and a country mad with open opposition. Now the vision of thousands of the best people of Spain has been lifted beyond the narrow barriers erected by the Church, and in their hearts has been planted a longing to be intellectually and spiritually free. These are

SPAIN

the present conditions that so widely prevail there. New ideas of personal liberty in religious thought and practice have already taken root in the minds of the thinking men of Spain.

The opposition to the rule of the priests, as dictated by the Vatican with its Italian advisors who are not sufficiently familiar with the conditions in other countries, has been growing among the Spaniards for nearly a quarter of a century. This growth was greatly accelerated by the successful revolt of the French and the open break between the papacy and the French Government. Although the educated classes in Spain are Catholics by long-established national tradition, and it therefore is entirely natural for them to feel reluctant about separating from the Church of their fathers and of their own childhood, yet there is evidence all over this peninsula of a strong and growing nationalism which for some time has resented, and is now openly resisting, the interference of Rome in purely domestic matters. It is hardly fair for the Catholic press to brand the leaders in this nationalism as "Atheists"

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

because they protest against the interference of the Church in governmental policies.

Constitutionally Spain is not a theocratic State. The clergy is not a part of the government and has access to Parliament only as the representative of a social element of the nation, a few members of which are appointed to the Senate. According to Article Eleven of the Spanish Constitution, freedom from molestation is guaranteed to non-Catholic Spanish citizens; also is the right established to perform the ceremonies of all cults or not to practice any, which was formerly considered a crime. Here can be seen that the prevalent religious régime is one of tolerance, which has often been very grossly misused. Up to the present time the establishment of non-Catholic churches or chapels was allowed only on condition that no signs revealing the character of the building should be displayed, nor was the performance in public of any religious ceremony allowed. Another aspect of this limitation which foreigners have noticed is the fact that within the Royal Palace there is only a Catholic chapel, and non-Catholic princes visiting the

SPAIN

Spanish royalty have to seek outside a chapel of their national or private religious denominations, while it is well known that in the palace of the King of England Catholic chapels are open for the use of royal visitors professing that religion.

The Protestant missionaries of Spain look for a brighter day. In 1910 the Cortes encouraged the Protestant workers by reviving a paragraph of the Constitution of 1869, which declared the "Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion" to be the religion of the State, but added: "In Spain and its dependencies no person shall be molested on account of his religious opinions, nor for the exercise of his form of worship, as long as he respects Christian morality in a becoming manner. At the same time no other public ceremonies nor manifestations are permitted than those of the religion of the State." The new enactment authorized Protestants to make their Church known as such by inscriptions on the outside. The revival of the measure of toleration, quoted above, was accomplished by revoking a law of 1876 which had rendered it practically nugatory. The original meas-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ure had seemed to allow freedom of religious opinion and worship, merely barring the "public ceremonies" and "manifestations" of the Protestants. The law of 1876, however, interpreted the prohibition in pretty sweeping terms, so that crosses, bells, spires, Gothic arches and windows, and, indeed, everything that looked at all religious had to go. All the inscriptions or crosses upon churches which were not Roman Catholic had to be removed. It was even regarded as a public manifestation when the singing of the children in a school was heard on the street. The façade of the secondary school built by Pastor Franz Fliedner in Madrid had to be altered because a clock, a vane, and a Gothic arch were regarded as manifestations of a dissenting form of worship. Cabrera had to remove a cross from his church in Madrid. The same thing happened with an English chapel in Barcelona, and the German churches in Madrid and Barcelona were cautiously built inside gardens and left without towers. Other articles and decrees interfere unwarrantably with the rights of those who do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church.

SPAIN

The thirteenth paragraph of the Spanish Constitution secures the right of expressing his opinions to every one. The supreme tribunal even permits the exercise of scientific criticism of the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and makes insult and mockery alone punishable. But in reality persons have been punished by the law because they did not uncover before the host on the open street and, when called to account, quietly replied that their convictions would not allow them to do so. At the same time it is customary for the Spaniards to call the host, when carried by the priest to a dying person, "the little God," and when carried around in solemn procession, "the great God." They have no idea how deeply such expressions offend truly religious feeling.

The law in regard to marriage in Spain is rather peculiar. Of course, Catholicism, being accepted as the official religion, the civil code does not recognize the right to contract matrimony by the civil form except to non-Catholics. The Catholics perform it canonically, and the State only intervenes in the act by the presence of a municipal judge or

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

a delegate who draws up a license by virtue of which the marriage is recorded in the Civil Registry. The civil power in this matter, therefore, is subordinate to the ecclesiastic. In regard to the requirements exacted from parties contracting matrimony before a municipal judge, the liberal government resolved to amplify the formula by exempting the contracting parties from the obligation that has always been placed on Catholics. This concession was not approved by the clericals; they feared that some broad-minded Catholics, if relieved of that declaration, might contract a civil marriage, and so they later induced the conservative government to revoke the royal decree of the Liberals.

The number of priests paid by the State is nearly forty thousand. These regular or monastic clericals (friars) enjoyed practically absolute freedom to establish themselves in Spain; hence in these later years numerous orders proceeding from the Philippine Islands and from France have established themselves in that country, although an article of the Concordat of 1851, still in force, limits to three the number of these

SPAIN

orders which may be established in Spain. The secular clergy even depends for its existence and for the support of a number of its dioceses on the national budget, an expenditure which is considered excessive by public opinion. This financial dependency on the State is largely responsible for the alienation of ecclesiastical property.

To give a brief account of conditions we quote from Gerundo, a Spanish monk, who has left the Catholic Church and is now lecturing in Germany, and who makes rather curious statements regarding the increase of monastic life in Spain. Going back to 1808, the year of the French invasion, he says that there were at that time 46,568 persons in that country living in 1,940 monasteries. He is unable to say how many nuns were there at that period, but he thinks that their number was not far short of ninety thousand. Under the French rule the number of monks diminished, and until 1875 the number fluctuated very considerably. In 1875, however, things began to settle down. In that year in the diocese of Barcelona there were only twenty-two monasteries. At the present time

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

there are 482. In this diocese the number of Catholic churches, monasteries, nunneries, seminaries, and confraternities number no less than six thousand, which cost the State the incredible sum of thirty million dollars a year, or over thirty dollars for every head of population in the diocese. Official statistics place the number of actual monasteries in Spain at 4,320, with 200,000 monks. The number of female convents is still difficult to obtain with any degree of accuracy; but Gerundo, quoting from the only statistics available, reckons them at over 7,300, with 376,000 nuns. And this Spanish monk says in his lecture that it is far easier to give the number of monks and nuns in figures than to give in figures the demoralizing influences of these persons, or the incredible superstition and the ignorance for which they are directly responsible.

The clergy in Spain by its diffusion, its privileges, and the favor it enjoys among the rich classes, possesses not only considerable social power, but in fact also exercises a great political influence. The prevailing tone

SPAIN

of the religious politics of the clergy causes the public to confound them all under the denomination of "Carlists," an appellation equivalent to the one of "Clerical" and of "Ultra-Catholic," and this is supposed to mean Absolutist and anti-Liberal opinions in politics. Its attitude on the labor problem, siding always with the employers and fighting the labor unions, has led the Liberals and the working men, who are non-Catholics, to consider the clergy in general as an active political and social enemy. The secular clergy even mixes in politics, and each such politician is popularly called an "electioneering priest"—a personage who, mounted on a horse, goes all over the district seeking votes, and from the pulpit recommends candidates and takes his parishioners to the polls to vote, influencing them by threats or by using religious arguments. In addition to all this we find the organization of the Catholic press, whose object it is to fight and to compete before the community with the liberal publications. It is reported that not a few priests, on receiving the confession of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

their penitents, refuse to absolve them if they decline to abandon reading some paper of the “naughty press.”

In Spain, as in many other countries, Catholicism prefers to be forced into submission rather than to grant concession to other beliefs; and this spirit goes hand in hand with the firm belief in the absolute superiority of the ecclesiastical power over the civil power in all spheres of life. So in their peculiar conception of the religious sphere there is hardly any question—political, judicial, scientific, economic, even artistic—which does not fall under their jurisdiction. Being suspicious of everything new, they consider it dangerous, and from such ecclesiastics have emanated attacks and snares against institutions and modern works of education. The same attacks were extended to patriotic undertakings, those in favor of peace and culture, such as the establishment of intellectual intercourse with the Spanish-American countries. These monks, nuns, Jesuits, and priests are the sworn subjects of the pope, and owe no allegiance to any other ruler. Patriotism, as the American

SPAIN

understands it, has no claims on them, no music to charm, no bonds to hold. For them all power is concentrated in the Vatican, of which the pope is the figure-head, and the Italian and other advisors, who are not sufficiently familiar with the conditions in other countries, make the laws. Here are the laws these Spanish clericals are sworn to obey, no matter in what country they may reside. Their State is the Church of Rome; their king is the man in the Vatican, or his secretary, Merry del Val; their law is the bare word of the infallible. Rebellion against the laws of any country, if they conflict with the utterances of the papacy, is for them logical; nay, more, it is their clear duty. We see this position plainly illustrated in the recent debate in the Spanish Senate, on the projected law against religious congregations—that is, against monasteries, nunneries, and the various orders housed in such ecclesiastical buildings—when the Bishop of Cadiz strenuously maintained that the State is incompetent to legislate in regard to persons who have placed themselves under the authority of the Church. He contended that when a

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

monk or a nun takes the vows peculiar to any religious order, he thereby renounces his rights as a citizen of the State and becomes a subject of the Church. And he went on to assert that the civil power altogether exceeds its authority when it proceeds to busy itself with religious questions and presumes to legislate touching religious matters. But the Bishop of Cadiz failed to see the other side of the question. If this position is logical for monks and nuns, Jesuits and priests, it is no less logical, no less the duty of a State which regards them as subversive of the interests and order of the community at large, either to drive them from its borders or constrain them to submit to a régime set up for the very purpose of safeguarding its own existence against their conspiracies.

Spain to-day has some modern Catholics who do not possess the characteristics of the cunning Jesuits. They are disposed to listen to the voice of the times which calls them to the labor of peace and harmony, and to share in the social movement and advancement that lie outside of the strict limit of a prescribed religion. Some of them entertain new ideas

SPAIN

in regard to the change of the present régime, relative to the budget of the clergy, aiming at economic independence for the Church. Among the laity, of course, the sense of tolerance and communion with the ideals of the country are naturally much stronger. As stated in conservative publications of Spain, there exists a considerable number of Catholics—at least as sincere as the men with an attitude of continual hostility to the State—whose desires are centering on harmony between the Holy See and the Spanish Government, regardless of its political significance. It commonly happens that these modern Catholics, inclined to a compromise, do not care to express plainly and energetically their ideas. They are afraid of being called “Modernists,” for many of them have met, even in some work of culture or of a social character, with such an animosity from many of their colleagues that, after untold unpleasantness, they were compelled to withdraw. It is to be greatly regretted that the moderate Catholics are lacking in civic courage.

Men knowing the conditions in Spain, like

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Pastor Theodore Fliedner and others, tell us that the mass of the people are yet untouched by modern skepticism and are deeply religious. Fliedner says in an open letter to *Auf der Warte* (September 4, 1910): "There is greater need than ever before that all of evangelical Christendom unite as one to help Spain with her highly talented, yet deeply unfortunate people to know Him who alone in His person is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Plainly have the Spanish people shown to the world that they are tired of the tyranny of Rome."

The religion of the Spanish people is simple in the extreme; some would call it gross superstition, yet they have learned to distinguish between the priest and religion. The strife between the government and the papal authorities is one of the most striking signs of the times, and marks the change that is coming over the ideals of the peoples and their rulers. If we would think of a modern nation that seemingly has endured all things for the sake of its religious traditions, surely it must be Spain. This nation has endured many things and has for long

SPAIN

been the chosen and most obedient child of the pope. This in spite of the fact, so well known to all students of history, that the decline of the national prestige and the falling away of all heroic traditions were to be traced, directly or indirectly, to the pitiful subserviency of the whole State to the interests of a corrupt and an alien despotism. Now at last Spain has some glimpses of the truth, and the king has determined, under the guidance of his government, that he will be master in his own house. Even if the Catholic press in this country, as well as in Europe, asserts that Spain is receiving a great deal of attention from "prejudiced writers and shallow observers," yet the indisputable fact remains that you can not deceive the people all the time in a struggle for religious as well as civil liberty.

We must pay some attention in this connection to the little Kingdom of Portugal, where, through all its stormy history, Roman Catholicism has remained the State religion. The considerable deflection from that Church in Portugal may be traced either to educational or political movements, rather than to

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the desire for religious reform. Toward the close of the eighteenth century the gradual infiltration of the ideas of the French philosophers inaugurated a "Liberal" tendency among the cultured classes, which has steadily grown until to-day about fifty per cent of the educated Portuguese, if not professedly infidels, are in open opposition to the clergy. This movement away from the Church of Rome has been limited somewhat by the dense ignorance of the great mass of the people and the scant attention paid to education. In 1878 the illiterates were 82 per cent of the population, and in 1909 they still comprised 78.6 per cent. In 1900 there were only 240,000 pupils in the elementary schools of Portugal, though education has been declared compulsory since 1844. Likewise in the political affairs of Portugal the nineteenth century marked a persistent struggle by certain elements of the population for "Liberal" principles. The pernicious interference by the Roman Catholic clergy to defeat the aims of this movement attracted a constantly increasing hatred from the work-

SPAIN

ing classes and has developed a strong anti-clerical party among the masses themselves. Indeed, the overthrow of the monarchy in October, 1910, with the flight of the young King Manuel, seems to indicate that liberal principles have now won to their support the majority of the people.

The Portuguese clergy, who now find themselves homeless and wanderers in alien lands, are not exempt from blame for their distressful plight. And if the clergy fell with the monarchy, it is because they were its victim. The Conservatives (the party nominally devoted to religion and the monarchial régime), like the other parties, have not had, during the late years, in reality any other political program than their own interests, understanding the word in its lowest sense. The Portuguese are a good people, and if the clergy had done its whole duty the farmers and villagers, though ignorant, would be bound to their priests and devoted to their Church. It is reported that the priests in the country exploited farms, and they were oftener seen at sales than in the sanctuary.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

In spiritual matters it is not so long ago that most of the clergy busied themselves in everything else except the ministry.

The most recent statistics indicate that the secular clergy in Portugal numbers 93,979 parish priests in a total population of 5,423,132; an average of one priest to every fifty-seven inhabitants. Portugal, Catholic to the core, has at length aroused herself and driven out priests, friars, and nuns, bag and baggage, and is fully decided they shall not return. Now, to an outsider all this appears passing strange. If it is true, as we are so frequently told, that monks and nuns are such desirable people, doing much good work and spreading the odor of sanctity in the neighborhoods where they congregate, how does it happen that they are driven out of places where they have lived so long, and where one could naturally expect to find them surrounded with sympathy and affectionate devotion? Whence arises this extraordinary aversion in Catholic countries against their pastors, their confessors, and their masters? Is not the fact eloquent to unprejudiced eyes? If it were

SPAIN

the Chinese who had taken up arms against them, we could understand it as arising from a natural anti-Christian sentiment; but here is a people who are baptized and confirmed, who belong to the Church. They regard this army of celibates, marshaled by the Jesuits, as pernicious and harmful to the best interests of their country. It is the work of renegades, the pope would have us believe. But this is not true. The Portuguese and Spaniards have not abjured Christianity. They are patriots, lovers of their country, whose consciences have been awakened by a national danger, and to a knowledge of citizen rights, of which the papacy would deprive them.

VIII

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

IN the present pope's struggle with the Modernists the Vatican is showing more than ordinary capacity for blundering deliverances. Justice, however, demands that not all stones should be thrown at Pope Pius X. Leo XIII repeatedly sinned against the spirit of the modern times. He placed Thomas Aquinas, and with him the Middle Ages, on the cathedra. In 1897, through the "Constitutio Officiorum," he renewed the regulations concerning certain books not agreeable to the ecclesiastical authorities, where he threatened not only authors and publishers of such books with excommunication, but also the public that would read them. Leo XIII condemned Americanism and placed Herman Schell's books on the Index; and how harmless are Schell and Americanism as compared to real Modernists! He insulted Protestantism repeatedly. Sometimes it has almost

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

seemed as if he would make belief in the necessity and inalienableness of the Church-State a dogma. But Leo XIII was too wise and highly cultured, and would therefore not allow an awkward compromise. He respected science; sometimes he commanded, even threatened. He would hardly strike the offender, not even Alfred Loisy, although there had not been a theologian in the Catholic Church for centuries who left the traditional paths of Catholicism so far as Loisy did. Consequently modern methods in the solution of theological problems are introduced by the researchers in Catholic exegesis and history. Yet Leo XIII was not so scientifically and Modernistically inclined as some Modernists would have us believe.

In the summer of 1903 Pius X succeeded Leo XIII. Pius X possesses certain characteristics which arouse more sympathy in certain quarters than the malleability of Leo XIII. He is a profoundly religious nature, and has consecrated his strength to the fortification of Catholic doctrine, obsolete as it might seem to some Modernists. In spite of his blunders, which are noticeable in the bat-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tle with the French authorities, we see the imposing quietness of Pius X. Even the most destructive Modernists will admit that he personifies in himself and in his personal life the ideal of Catholic Christianity. Paul Sabatier, the noted Protestant theologian of France, the great admirer of Saint Francis, says that none of the cardinals has made so many blunders in such a short time as Pius X, but in his personality Sabatier finds the most attractive phenomenon of the present time. He lauds his meekness. Whoever nears the inner life of Pope Pius X will immediately recognize the man of pure heart. But the problems of the present time, the needs of theology, are unknown to him; he is not familiar with the belief or unbelief of twentieth century humanity. The religion of the Middle Ages has not left the Vatican. He sees the salvation of the Church in the condemnation of all new thoughts. With him the future of Christianity lies only in the renewal of the scholastic past. In the simple religious certainty of a humble parish priest, not in sympathy with present-day difficulties which modern scientific research throws into

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

the path of traditional Catholic doctrine, he stands exalted and sublime above all dogmatic doubts; consequently he expects every Catholic, priest and layman alike, to be with him in spirit and in doctrine. So he recognized in the labor and theology of the Modernists, although most of them hunger and thirst after righteousness, nothing but pride, sin, and unbelief, instead of a movement to saturate superstitious Italy and godless France with the life, faith, and spirit of the gospel. Pius X is always pope, always and at all times the tool of divine revelation. Piety alone is not sufficient to guide the ecclesiastical ship of Roman Catholicism through the stream of modern and twentieth century tendencies.

It is self-evident that a pope like Pius X will not limit his work to the destruction of Modernism. He removed from office unworthy Italian bishops and "unpleasantly touched" more than one prelate. When the Holy Father reformed the Roman Curia, two years ago, he reformed the pay of the officials also. One of the most striking features of his reign thus far has been the official pro-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

motion of the use of the Gregorian chant throughout all churches of the Roman Catholic communion.

Pius X saw his special mission from the beginning in his battle against the Modernists. In the encyclical of October 3, 1903, he promised to stand on guard, so that the members of the clergy would not be caught in the so-called snares of the new and sophistical science, which, he says, has nothing in common with Christ, and which under pretense and arguments introduces the heresies of rationalism and semi-rationalism. In January, 1904, he confirmed the precepts of Leo XIII concerning the study of scholastic philosophy; presently, he said then, we must with all our might fight the new rationalism, which is especially dangerous to the academic youth. In March, 1906, the professors in exegesis were placed under the solemn duty never to depart from the common doctrine and tradition of the Church. In a papal letter of July 28, 1906, addressed to the Italian bishops, he paid close attention to the "Modernism" of the young clericals and the Chris-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

tian Democrats. Young clericals can only for sufficient reasons visit the universities; daily papers they should never read, and periodicals only under episcopal supervision. A priest that would not give implicit obedience to the ecclesiastical instructions could be removed from the pulpit, if necessary, even during the preaching of a sermon. According to this letter no priest or cleric was allowed to lecture on any theme without the permission of the bishop. The affiliation with any society which had not the episcopal sanction was likewise strictly forbidden. May 5, 1907, the pope gave his precepts concerning the scientific education of the Italian clerics. The former rule prevailed, according to which the same professor is responsible for the entire theological discipline in the seminaries. Pope Pius X instituted that the instructors in philosophy and theology must submit all their manuscripts for the classroom, before they are read, to the papal Reform Commission for Seminaries, and then to the bishop for certification. The Index Congregation worked zealously, as a number

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

of Modernistic periodicals were condemned before anything was ever known about the Modernist encyclical.

Characteristic of the theological position of Pius X is the reorganization of the Bible Commission and the decrees under the new régime. Leo XIII had organized this commission for the benefit of a temperate progress within the Church of Rome; Pius X placed the stamp of his “*Restaurare*” upon the work of the commission as well as on all endeavors of Catholicism. All deliberations are keenly guarded by the mighty papal secretary, Mgr. Merry del Val; Modernistic members, some probably only inclined that way, are quickly removed. This man of the Roosevelt-Fairbanks-affair fame, the Vatican statesman of many blunders, and the Vigilance Committee keep a watchful eye on suspects and take prudent but prompt and efficacious measures. Under this régime excommunication, like silver in the day of Solomon, is “nothing accounted of;” so broadcast has been its distribution that it is difficult to find a single thinking Catholic in Italy by whom it has not been incurred.

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

The year 1907 marked the beginning of the real struggle. On April 17th the pope delivered a passionate address in the open consistory against the disturbers "who under deceitful methods teach and distribute atrocious heresies about the development of the dogma, the return to the pure gospel (cleansed from the theological interpretations and the decrees of the councils). You conceive, reverend brothers, that we must guard with all our might the foundation of faith. We have reason to be disturbed concerning these attacks, which are not only one heresy, but the substance and poison of all heresies, which also threaten to undermine our faith and destroy Christianity." This war-cry was uttered concerning Italian Modernism to which we have referred in the chapter on "Italy."

The Syllabus of July 3-4, 1907, officially known as the "Decree of the Holy Officium Lamentabili," is a catalogue of sixty-five heresies; the Congregation of the Inquisition had prepared this manuscript at the request of the Holy Father and submitted it to him July 3d for ratification. He signed it July

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

4th, commanding that every cleric and true Catholic must reject the sixty-five maxims of the Syllabus. The Syllabus was far-reaching for Catholic theology, as according to the division of Michelitsch they referred to the duty-bound power of the ecclesiastical teaching profession, the inspiration of the Bible and Gospel research, revelation and the dogma; the Divinity of Christ, His person and work; the sacraments; the constitution of the Church, and Christian truth. Loisy has proven that the Syllabus was prepared with special reference to the five books of this noted Modernist, which were placed on the Index in 1903. But the Syllabus mentioned neither Loisy nor any other author; yet in the sixty-five maxims could easily be recognized an assault upon the historicocritical trend of Modernism. A number of these pretended or so-called heresies—for instance, the heresy concerning the origin and especially the formation of the sacraments, and the Church government or the hierarchy—are to-day considered absolute truth among all students who have liberated themselves from the suppositions and the coercion of

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

the Roman dogma. Another class stands as indisputable facts, while a third class—namely, the maxims concerning the character of the Gospel according to St. John—applies to the right wing of Protestant theology as well, and is considered a heresy.

Pius X commands and prohibits in the Syllabus not so much certain distinct opinions concerning the Bible, Christ, and the sacraments, and Church government as those relating to the origin of the Bible, the Christological dogma, and the sacraments, referring not only to the present age with its life and faith, but especially to the past and the history of life and faith in the Church. The veto of censure can not overcome Bible criticism; of course, the pope assumes and acts as all of his predecessors. The Syllabus indicated the temper of the Vatican, and was prophetic of fuller utterances to follow.

In the nature of the case it is difficult to define briefly and accurately the position of the Modernists, and they protested against the pope's characterization of them; yet it must be conceded that the encyclical "Pascendi Dominici Gregis," of September 8,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

1907, is an exhaustive treatise upon existing conditions, and does not miss the mark entirely. It covered some forty-eight octavo pages and was a furious fulmination against what is called "Modernism." This term is ambiguous, and in itself means nothing. It is rather an epithet than a name. It is taken neither from the name of a teacher, as Platonism and Darwinism, nor from some distinguishing fundamental principle, as idealism and evolutionism. Professor Charles A. Briggs says, in the *North American Review* of February, 1908, that the term, as applied to a religious party in the Catholic Church, is unknown to our dictionaries. While those so designated made no serious objection to the use of the term as applied to themselves, yet it meant nothing unless it be a new attitude toward the Church as opposed to the old or traditional attitude. Mgr. Canon Moyes in a very able article says, "It is possible to define it, at least in a broad and general way, by saying that it is a form of belief which finds the origin of all religion and knowledge of God in the soul's internal sense and experience." Archbishop Ireland,

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

in the *North American Review*, April 1908, refers to Modernism in these words, "The radical mistake of Modernism and of its methods of apologetics is that it excludes, or at least minimizes, overmuch the functions of the intellect, thereby reducing its theodicy to sentiment—to mere subjectivism." This subjectivism, however, which regards consciousness as revelation and religiousness as religion is indeed one very prominent aspect of advanced modern thought, growing more or less directly out of the evolution theory, and, whether taught by the Loisys or Tyrrells or by the Sabatiers and Campells, is assuredly a menace to the integrity of apostolic Christianity. The encyclical *Pascendi* itself affects no definition. It declared Modernism to be a sort of loose heap of errors rather than a definite system, and charged Modernists with deliberately scheming that it should be so. The encyclical defined Modernism as "the synthesis of all heresies," and added that it "means destruction, not of the Catholic religion alone, but of all religion." No charges were made against the moral character of Modernists, and while it

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

was conceded that "they possess, as a rule, a reputation for the strictest morality," yet they were pronounced "the most pernicious of all the adversaries of the Church."

Back of Modernism, says Pope Pius X, is a certain philosophy, which may be called Agnosticism, and which also emphasizes the doctrine of Immanence. The manifestations of religion are classified with other psychological phenomena, and Christianity is compared with other religions. All the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic religion are changed. Instead of the impartation of truth, revelation becomes experience, and the distinction between the natural and the supernatural vanishes. Dogmas become symbols. Faith rests no longer on authority, but on personal experience. Even the very pillars upon which the Church rests, Scripture and tradition, are removed. Holy Scripture is a collection of extraordinary and special experiences, and inspiration in a specific sense is done away with. Tradition is a kind of impartation of the original experience. Even the sacraments, which constitute the

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

Church's most valuable possession, are infringed upon by the Modernists. They hold that in religion everything must have grown out of inner impulses and needs, and they doubt the immediate institution of the sacraments by Christ. They undermine the Church and her authority. The Church is not for the Modernists, according to the pope's encyclical, an institution founded by Christ, but is "a fruit of the collective consciousness." Authority is necessary for the unity of religious consciousness, but it must not be tyrannical; it must come to terms with freedom. That which is truly living is subject to change. The logic of the Modernist's position is to abolish the distinction between priest and layman. In view of these and other positions the pope comes to the conclusion that Modernism is a synthesis of all heresies, and consequently orders that the most stringent measures be taken for its suppression. And it must be asserted, with Professor Karl Holl of Berlin, that the pope has no other course open to him. He says that it is not a question of Pius X or Leo

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

XIII; any pope would have had to do the same. Some undoubtedly in a somewhat different manner.

In the papal judgment the Modernist is, as a philosopher, an Agnostic. A severe castigation of Agnosticism follows. The pope is undoubtedly right in his general estimate of Agnosticism, which is but the full-grown fruit of a merely empirical or phenomenological conception of science, developing its defective epistemology from the negative side of Kant's Critical Philosophy. But the Modernists strongly deny, on what we regard as very plausible grounds, that they are Agnostics. And certainly very many of them are not that, even in the most orthodox sense of the word. Is it not strange that the pope should not perceive the signs of the times, which plainly show that Agnosticism of the Huxleyan and Spencerian type is already somewhat past, and that some sort of idealism bids fair to claim the succeeding ascendancy?

The Modernist, as theologian, taking his cue from himself as philosopher, aims at the "conciliation of faith and science, always,

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

however, saving the primacy of science over faith.” The principle of faith is in all men; that principle is God; therefore God is in all men. This is the doctrine of divine immanence. The expression of this inner principle is never complete; it is fragmentary, symbolic, imperfect. Here Father Tyrrell is seen between the lines. Of course, creeds, confessions, even encyclicals, are symbols, algebraic signs of truth, reports of progress —nothing more. The encyclical “*Pascendi*” works this out in relation to the sacraments, the Scriptures, and the Church, and this is really one of the strongest sections. It should interest all Americans to read these words: “For as faith is subordinated to science, as far as phenomenal elements are concerned, so too in temporal matters the Church must be subject to the State. They do not say this openly as yet, but they are logically committed to it. For, given the principle that in temporal matters the State possesses absolute mastery, it will follow that when the believer, not fully satisfied with his merely internal acts of religion—such, for instance, as the administration or reception of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the sacraments—these will fall under the control of the State. . . . Such are their ideas about disciplinary authority. But far more advanced and far more pernicious are their teachings on doctrinal and dogmatic authority.” This brief quotation may be enough to enable the Roman Catholic citizen of this country, where the formal separation of Church and State is an alphabetic principle, to decide whether to be a patriotic American means to be a pernicious Modernist.

When the pope speaks of the Modernist as an historian who harks back to his own philosophy, and, accordingly, knows nothing except phenomena, and so the things that are out of sight, such as God and the divine side of external religion—as these things are handed over by the historian to the sacred domain of faith (hence the modern talk about the Christ of history being one thing, and the Christ of faith quite another)—Pius X is here striking at no imaginary evil. Whether we are in harmony with him in some of his other, rather peculiar, assumptions or not, we must, as orthodox Christians, be with

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

him here, as we are also bound to consent that this blow is not misplaced.

Concerning the Modernist's attempt at higher criticism of the Holy Scripture we may let the encyclical "Pascendi" speak for itself: "To hear them talk about their works on the Sacred Books in which they have been able to discover so much that is defective, one would imagine that before them nobody ever even glanced through the pages of Scripture, whereas the truth is that a whole multitude of doctors, infinitely superior to them in genius, in erudition, in sanctity, have sifted the Sacred Books in every way, and so far from finding imperfections in them, have thanked God more and more the deeper they have gone into them, for His divine bounty of having vouchsafed to speak thus to them. Unfortunately these great doctors did not enjoy the same aids to study that are possessed by Modernists for their guide and rule—a philosophy borrowed from the negation of God and a criterion which consists of themselves. . . . Let one of them but open his mouth, and the others applaud him

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

in chorus, proclaiming that science has made another step forward; let an outsider but hint at a desire to inspect the new discovery with his own eyes, and they are on him in a body; deny it, and you are an ignoramus; embrace it and defend it, and there is no praise too warm for you. . . . The imprudence of others have combined to generate a pestilence in the air which penetrates everywhere and spreads the contagion."

The Modernist has two shields of defense as apologist. The first is the objective. Its general idea, according to the great papal letter, was christened in Agnosticism, and, according to the principles and processes of evolution, it has developed into the social and sacramental and institutional religion of to-day. The other is the subjective, and it is able to tell the non-believer that down deep in his nature are the need and desire for religion, and that this religion is, in implication, Roman Catholicism. Here again we catch the echoes of Tyrrell, and Tyrrell has not been the only man who has tried to convince people that because they had in them the desire for religion, therefore, *ipso facto*,

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

they already possess the very thing they desire. The pope does not forget in his celebrated letter the reformer; here the Modernist is charged with trying to overthrow nearly everything which the Church thinks it worth while to maintain. "With this reforming mania in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten." They would change the present order of things in philosophy, in history, in dogma, in worship, and in episcopal administration and authority; so the Modernist in the Church of Rome is looked upon as a sort of an ecclesiastical iconoclast or anarchist.

In the struggle with the Modernist, as seen in the encyclical "Pascendi," the pope by no means forgets the necessary remedies for the suppression and, possibly, extinction of Modernism. The first remedy prescribed is exceedingly significant. It is the study of scholastic philosophy on which "the theological edifice is to be solidly raised." The second remedy, as a practical application, must be administered to all such teachers and priests; in fact, to anybody who in any way is found to be imbued with Modernism.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

They should immediately be excluded without compunction from the offices of directors and professors in seminaries and Catholic universities. We further notice the episcopal vigilance over publications. Bishops are enjoined to perform the duty of exercising a careful and constant watch upon all books produced, sold, and read in their dioceses. In the remedy of censorship the regulation is so rigid, so thorough, and so searching that one is at once, in reading it, carried back into the atmosphere of mediæval times. In order that Modernists might not ventilate and defend their views, congresses and public gatherings are to be tolerated on very rare occasions only, and when permitted, no mention is to be made of Modernism, or even laicism. By all means through the vigilance committees, which are to be set at work in every diocese, must even the buds of all poisonous weeds of Modernism be extracted, while at the triennial returns from all the bishops the Holy See must be furnished with a sworn and intelligent report upon the whole situation.

The Italian Modernists answered the
198

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

pope in October, 1907, through their "Programma dei Modernisti." This "Programma" asserted that Catholics for many reasons had lost their sense of personal responsibility, and they consequently tolerate the actions of the highest authority not with a rational independence, but rather with insensible submission. So this highest authority has lost its real field of action and of limitation, and has changed a sound religious government into a pure absolutism. The Modernists believed that they could do a great favor to the Roman Church by removing the predominant lack of judgment, and further by placing their ideas before the Church for discussion. Such ideas, however, were condemned by the highest Catholic authority, as they were not well enough known. In addressing the pope these words are found: "Father, hear us. We offer you a remedy which already has proven to be more or less successful to restore the power, formerly possessed by the Church over the world, but which unfortunately has been lost. Remember your responsibility toward God, society, and history, before you reject us,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

and before you solemnly confine yourself within the ranch of ideas of the political and intellectual theocracy of the Middle Ages.” They plainly laid their system of Modernism before Pius X with an analysis of the encyclical “*Pascendi*.” The Italian Modernists hoped earnestly that the pope would listen to their “*Programma*,” in which they humbly asserted that the doctrine and labor of the Modernist propaganda had stood the test and would not vanish, but they were greatly disappointed. It is said the pope yawningly laid the book aside, saying that he never had read such a tiresome book. In fact the book was too earnest and demanded considerable scientific apprehension, so could not be read at leisure. But Pius X was not yawning very long; we find him on October 29, 1907, excommunicating the instigators, authors, and all co-laborers on the “*Programma dei Modernisti*.” The answer of the pontiff followed in his “*Motu Proprio*” of November 18, 1907.

The “*Programma dei Modernisti*” had been published anonymously, therefore the excommunication of its authors had only

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

theoretical value. Yet Pius X gave vent to his feelings and anger whenever he was able to seize any of the Modernist leaders. Romolo Murri and Antonio Fogazzaro had been disciplined before; now the axe fell upon Umberto Fracassini, rector of the clerical seminary in Perugia, Salvatore Minocchi deemed it necessary in December, 1907, to cease the publication of the *Studi Religiosi*. In February, 1908, he was also suspended on account of his lecture on "Earthly Paradise and the Dogma of Original Sin," as he refused to retract certain statements. In the summer of 1908 the Jesuit Bartoli, who had just returned from the Catholic Mission University at Mangalur, India, was stationed in Ireland as a punishment for writing certain questionable political newspaper articles. As Modernist he could choose between renouncing his functions as priest or return to the mission field at Mangalur. Hurt in his inmost soul, he rejected every compromise and immediately left the convent and later the Church.

The difference between an encyclical and a Motu Proprio, as this latter was given in

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

September, 1910, is this: the encyclical deals only with doctrine; the *Motu Proprio* deals with discipline and practical matters. The only new part of this document (all the rest is a repetition of previous papal utterances) is the oath of orthodoxy and of fidelity to the Roman Catholic doctrine and discipline. This oath is to be taken by every professor before resuming his annual course, by every priest of an inferior order before his promotion, by all new confessors, parish priests, canons, and by every one who holds a special office in the Church.

Romolo Murri, the champion of Christian Democracy in Italy, editor of the *Commento* (October, 1910), a Modernist review, who is well aware that Modernism must not allow itself to be carried away by the flood of hypercriticism, lest it will be hurled into the sea of disbelief and thus be lost (already too many Italian Modernists have made shipwreck of themselves in that way), says, in answering Professor Salvatore Minocchi, who a short time ago was also a priest and editor of the now suppressed *Studi Religiosi*: "No, I will not shut myself up in a sterile,

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

unfruitful negation, as you have done. I believe in Christianity. . . . I find it necessary to have faith in what man has said and meant to say by formulas such as the following: Divine personality; individual immortality; working of God in history; absolute worth of the spiritual realities which shine in the historical life of Christ. And I count that I have a right to declare myself a Catholic; meaning by this very declaration to affirm that the pontiff (as he is at the present day) and his men have forfeited the right to speak and act in the name of the Church; and I claim for myself the right to handle freely, without subjection to nobody, all matters pertaining to historical Christianity. I declare myself a Catholic, I say, because I think that, as there is a living doctrine, there is also a living tradition handed down to us by Western, Latin, Italian culture and life; and from that tradition I do not want to sever myself." At the present hour this is the position of the large majority in the Modernist camp in Italy. Modernism in Italy at the present hour is very much alive. A member of the Roman clergy quotes a

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

prominent Italian paper, saying: "The Vatican has in its possession hundreds of documents proving that in the Roman Catholic Church there exists at present a secret Modernist organization, and that a sort of Freemasonry has been formed in order to foster and spread Modernism. The Vatican has succeeded in finding that a clandestine Modernist correspondence is kept up between some Churches, and even between various seminaries. We know, for instance, that from some seminaries circulars and writings are periodically issued in favor of Modernism. Whoever thinks that Modernism is dead or about to die is grossly mistaken."

The struggle of Pope Pius X with Modernists has demanded many victims in Italy, not only among men in high positions, but also among the ranks of the lower clerics, although their names may never appear in the annals of history. The answers from France were not less pronounced after the issuance of the Syllabus and the encyclical "Pascendi." When, in July, 1907, the Syllabus appeared, the reform paper *Le Demain*, of Lyon, suspended immediately its publica-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

tion with the following statement: "Beginning to-day, *Demain* suspends its publication for a few months. We have arrived at this conclusion entirely of ourselves and are convinced that our action will be understood. After recent developments the efforts and the thoughts of sincere Catholics have been so obscured and misjudged that it seemed to us necessary to wait for resumption and continuance of our endeavors without molestation until all is calm. . . . Time accomplishes its sovereign work quicker than ever. Should the moment arrive to resume this work again, then *Demain* will proceed, supported by all such men according to whose opinion the religion of Jesus Christ has no worse enemies than the lie and the sectarian spirit." Another periodical, *La Quinzaine*, which excellently has served Modernism for years, then ceased its publication.

In 1908 French Modernists followed their Italian friends in answering the pope's encyclical "Pascendi" through their "Lendemains d'Enzyclique." This answer of French Catholics to the pope was a masterpiece of French composition. Elegant ver-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

satility abounded; they showed sympathy for the Holy Father, cunning sarcasm, also bitter anger and indignation. They dedicated this answer to the harmless, humble, and humiliated priests, who had been prevented by a brutal interdict from consecrating bread and wine to the memory of the Lord; to the university and seminary professors, who had been torn from their students and whose books were defamed, also their spiritual life broken; to the monks in the monasteries, who had grown old and weary in their cowl, and who had saved nothing for old age but what God had given them, who were forced to forsake and leave the cell which they had chosen when barely twenty years of age, who would rather follow the dictates of their own conscience than the demands of their superiors; to the honest and magnanimous Christians who warningly informed their ecclesiastical friends that their Christianity of to-day is not in harmony with the spirit of the time; to the slandered and defamed, the victims of the brutal inquisition of Pope Pius X; to the rejected and restless of the great, fraternal Christian Church; to the dis-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

ciples of Christ who had stood and testified before their high priests for righteousness and truth, and consequently suffered in soul and body, and who, always without even a murmur, would endure all hardships for Christ and His gospel; to all those who in the latter days twice defenseless and sad bowed their heads before the voice of Rome and had to be ashamed of their Mother Church. In addition to the dedication the answer of the French Modernists contained the following points: 1. The Modernism of Pius X and the Modernists. 2. The Causes of Modernism mentioned by the pope are not mentioned. 3. The Persecution of Modernists; what will it accomplish? 4. History and Dogma, an unavoidable Conflict. 5. Encyclical and the Catholic Future. By Modernism, according to the French answer, is not so much meant a system as a method. It is even admitted, according to Roman Catholic development the pope was forced to act thus. Or, speaking with Ernest Renan, Modernists were convinced that "Catholicism can not perish, yet it can not remain as it is, although we can not see how it can

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

be otherwise. But the great moments, when all ways seem to be barricaded, are the great moments of Divine Providence."

The French bishops accepted the papal letters without very great opposition, even those who were inclined to be Modernists. They felt that they were bound to meet with an awful catastrophe, but would not speak openly. Rome, however, rejected all efforts at a compromise made by French bishops, claiming that it aimed to reorganize the Church in France. The Vatican would not even allow them to hold their eagerly-sought-for episcopal conference. Who can blame the French clergy for its indifference toward the theological needs of the Church, an indifference which is plainly seen in its scientific and moral attitude toward the encyclical. And yet it is an open question whether or not twelve courageous French bishops would not have been able to influence the pope by earnest presentations to alter his position, had they tried.

The first French victim in the Modernist struggle was Mgr. Battifol, rector at the Catholic Institute in Toulouse. Battifol is

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

neither a hypercritical nor a philosophical Modernist; courageously he had spoken in 1904 against Alfred Loisy. But he had written a history of the Catholic breviary, severely criticised certain Roman Catholic legends and traditions. We have referred to this controversy in the chapter on "France." Abbés Naudet and Dabry, Republican and Socialistic politicians under punishment of *suspensio a divinis*, were then prohibited from publishing any longer their periodicals *Justice Sociale* and *Vie Catholique*. Bishop Lacroix of Tarentaise and Bishop Sueur of Avignon later resigned their office. Finally, on March 4, 1908, Alfred Loisy, the arch-Modernist of France, was excommunicated. His simple reflections on the Decree *Lamentabili* and on *Pascendi* prompted the Vatican to take this last step. These reflections, a book of three hundred pages, close with an apostrophe to the pope: "Holy Father, let me tell you that Modernists would take a far different position toward your censures and reproaches than they actually take if they were such men as you brand them to be. If the one who writes these lines had

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

really been such an arrogant and proud man, such as you describe him especially in your encyclicals, he should never have remained in the Church to experience such humiliations during the last fifteen years." Now Loisy is excommunicated, and all faithful Catholics must avoid him. He said his reflections were not an act of indignation, but of truth. He would not submit to the Vatican's demands, and a reconciliation with the Church is impossible.

Concerning the condition in England after the publication of the encyclical, George Tyrrell answered the pope. September 30 and October 1, 1907, he published articles in the *Times*. The root-cause of his anger could be plainly seen when he referred to "Lamentabili" with its continuous assumption, indeed, insistence, that official theologians have a direct authority over historical science. Tyrrell protested against the manner in which absolute assent was being expected of scholars concerning condemnations to which the condemning authorities did not bind themselves. As to the "Pascendi," his anger arose from the everywhere apparent

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

contempt for mysticism and all the dim and inchoate gropings after God; its wholesale imputation of bad motives to respectable, hard-working scholars and thinkers, and its disciplinary enactments. These last two characteristics and sections he felt he must attribute to the pope personally; hence his tone toward the Roman pontiff. Father Tyrrell's personal friend, Friedrich von Flügel, says, "The more one attempted to palliate the disciplinary enactments, the more sure one was, at least amongst free peoples and amongst men of liberal education, to arouse prompt anger and contempt for Church officials." On October 22, 1907, the Bishop of Southwark received from the pope's secretary of State the intimation that Father Tyrrell was, in consequence of his letters to the *Times*, debarred from the sacraments, and that his case was reserved to Rome. On October 28, 1907, Tyrrell addressed a dignified letter to the Bishop of Southwark for transmission to Rome. On March 18, 1908, he writes to a friend, after the major excommunication was inflicted upon Abbé Loisy: "Looking back, our mistake has been our

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

zeal to help the disturbed intelligence of the minority to hold on to the Church. Our 'Synthesis' raised theological difficulties in solving historical; the officials have fastened on the former and have ignored the latter." From then on Father Tyrrell's tone became violently anti-Roman, with but few breaks until 1909.

In March, 1908, the Archbishop of Westminster, Dr. Bourne, issued a pastoral letter to his priest concerning the encyclical "Pascendi." All of the English bishops accepted the encyclical with obliging submission and assured the Holy Father that there were very few Modernists in England. Some of the English Catholic clergy had great sympathy for Modernists as men and not for their doctrines; consequently they were in danger of being influenced by the men, and were warned accordingly. Others, who did not know the importance and consequences of Modernism, and who were probably inclined to accept the theological, philosophical, and historical heresies of Modernism, had their eyes opened by this letter. A direct fruit of this Roman reaction in England is

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

undoubtedly the present agitation for a Catholic Church, free from Rome. This movement has ripened as a result of the struggle of Pope Pius X against the Modernists. Old Catholicism was introduced into England when, on February 18, 1908, seventeen priests and sixteen lay delegates met for a synod at Chelsfield, and elected the Roman priest, Rev. Arnold Harris Matthew, Earl of Landaff, consecrated in 1878, as their bishop. He joined the Utrecht Declaration of the Old Catholic Episcopacy and was consecrated as bishop, April 28, 1908, by the Archbishop of Utrecht, Holland. Bishop Matthew has in his diocese seventeen priests. The founding of the Old Catholic Church in England is about the only organized opposition the struggle against Modernists is encountering in England.

Hardly any attention was paid to the encyclical "Pascendi" in the United States of America. "Americanism," of which we shall speak later, had nothing to say, while the Catholic press hardly made mention of it. When George Tyrrell's "A Much Abused Letter" had been circulated in New York, the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Catholic Church of America first noticed Modernism. Archbishop O'Connell of Boston in a pastoral letter referred to the encyclical, stating that the pope was not acting in opposition to the spirit of the time. According to O'Connell, Modernism is nothing but a system made up of stubborn and seduced men, who intended to reconcile Catholic philosophy with the principles of Realism and Rationalism, who further attempted to accommodate the inflexible truth of God to the spirit of an ever-increasing godless generation, and who would bring the Catholic spiritual and moral ideals in conformity with a world which is in itself unable to advance to higher possibilities. With such a rude, realistic, and skeptic spirit of the times neither the pope nor the Church can come in conflict as long as the spirit of the times will remain within its own sphere. But when the things of a supernatural world are judged according to the measure of this world, then the conflict begins. The danger of Modernism can not be overestimated, for its philosophy coincides with the philosophy of non-Catholic universities in the United States.

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

The same spirit prevails in the scientific and historical literature of the present age; it is predominant in schools and colleges; it also endeavors to weaken historical and traditional Christianity. America is almost entirely submerged in practical life; pure and divine truth has, therefore, little or no influence. Archbishop O'Connell's statements must be taken with a grain of salt, especially the last one about the practical life, which often blossoms out into a beautiful spirit of benevolent work, as seen in the great home and foreign missionary enterprises; this spirit must rest upon a more secure foundation than selfishness.

In Germany two great Catholic papers, the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* and the *Germania*, had been working zealously for some time to harmonize the Catholic world and modern culture. They were greatly disappointed, however, when the *Syllabus* and the encyclical "Pascendi" appeared. The German Catholic bishops met for a conference December 10, 1907, in Cologne. As a result of this conference they sent a letter to the pope December 24, 1907, wherein they de-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

clared themselves willing to execute all papal demands most conscientiously. Then followed, in January, 1908, a pastoral letter by these bishops to their priests, wherein they stated that Germany had not one priest or Catholic layman who would not be willing to fight against the system and principles of Modernism in all its parts and possibilities, as plainly outlined in "Pascendi," though they very naturally took into consideration that even in Germany the tendencies for Modernistic theories could creep into the Catholic Church. They further demanded of their clergy to obey their superiors most sincerely, study Syllabus and "Pascendi" diligently, warned them not to be indifferent toward the ecclesiastical authority, urged most profound study as a preventive against the Modernistic contagion, especially the study of the philosophy of the classical and scholastic age. The *Kölnische Volkszeitung* reported that the episcopal conference sent a courteous request to the pope, asking him to take German conditions into consideration, for the bishops contended that the Roman encyclicals were not in every particular

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

adapted to German conditions, with special reference to the theological Catholic faculties in State universities. Dr. Johannes Kübel says Catholic authorities denied the bold statement and requested the paper to retract its assertions. This leading organ of German Catholicism, however, for sufficient reasons refused to do so.

Bavarian bishops, who had not attended the episcopal conference at Cologne, sent a special letter to their priests at the celebration of the golden jubilee of Pius X, commenting on the mild and friendly character of the pope, who so zealously had guarded the doctrine of the Cross, and who had prevented all attempts to adapt the Catholic faith to the present spirit of the age. The following sentence in the pastoral letter of the Bavarian bishops is significant in its message for Protestants as well as Catholics: "Religion has no fear of science; religion must be studied and well considered; it asks for research and demands investigation. Christianity never fears scientific analysis; it only fears ignorance." The State Department of Ecclesiastical Affairs

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

in Bavaria assumed a rather peculiar attitude toward the encyclical, according to which all papal letters are subject to State ratification. The bishops and the Center party of Germany, however, contested this movement. After the publication of the encyclical, when the State department had endeavored to please Catholic authorities and had requested the archibishop to lay the encyclical before them, the prelate heeded this request, but never asked for ratification. The department willingly promised its assistance in the execution of the demands in the papal letter, but was very poorly repaid for its friendly attitude, as the bishops never even noticed publicly this kindness of the State.

The first victim of the encyclical "Pascendi" in Germany was Beneficiary Dr. Thaddäus Engert, of Ochsenfurt. He had been a rather industrious scholar of Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch. When he published the first part of a larger work, known as "Die Urzeit der Bibel" ("The Primitive Times of the Bible"), the first chapter dealt with "The Creation of the World." Engert was

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

soon known as giving the results of later Oriental research and also the new Protestant conception of inspiration. Bishop Schlör, of Würzburg, took Engert earnestly to task, demanding of him to withdraw the book from publication and to recant. Engert, however, refused an immediate and unconditional recantation and asked for an extension of time. Consequently he was excommunicated and became editor of the *Zwanzigste Jahrhundert* in Munich. Soon after this occurrence the Bishop of Augsburg, basing his claims upon the encyclical "Pascendi," would not allow the priests in his diocese to organize a society which simply aimed at guarding their own interests. In other dioceses such already organized societies were forced to dissolve. According to a common pastoral letter of January, 1908, only such societies for priests were to be tolerated which confined their entire efforts to mutual sick-benefit, life insurance, etc.

The real battle about the encyclical "Pascendi" began through the newly founded *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* (Inter-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

national Weekly for Science, Art, and Technics). In December, 1907, there appeared an article by Friedrich Paulsen on "The Crisis of Catholic-theological Faculties in Germany." In January and February, 1908, several noted Protestant theologians took exception to Syllabus and "Pascendi," then including such men as Hauck, Tröltsch, Herrmann, Eucken, Walter Köhler, Harnack, and Paulsen. The articles by these noted scholars were doubtless the most important consideration of the encyclical on the Protestant side. Catholic theologians—men like Professor Meurer of Würzburg, Professors Ehrhard and Schnitzer of Munich, and Professor Mausbach of Münster—presented their objections. Albert Ehrhard fearlessly described the present status of Catholic theology; he regretted the tone and the literary form of the encyclical, referred to the answer of the Italian Modernists, contending that Modernism was something altogether different from the Vatican's presentation. Should Catholic theological faculties retain their position in the organism of German universities, then they must have unconditional free-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

dom in theological views; theological research must be granted the right to make itself felt in the whole sphere of theological science; this research must also retain the right to apply modern methods in the field of empirical, historical, critical, and psychological thought. If Catholic theology avoids these means, then it consequently loses every claim to the use of scientific methods in modern research and commits an unpardonable sin. Are the methods as recommended in the encyclical practically applied, then the Catholic theological university faculties of Germany are doomed to sink into the grave of their older sisters. Here Ehrhard referred to the Catholic faculties in France and Italy. This would mean the beginning of the end. The *Germania*, a leading Ultramontane paper, published the whole article of Ehrhard, and the anger of Rome was brought down upon Ehrhard. Pope Pius X deprived him of the title as a Roman prelate. Ehrhard, lacking the Teuton courage of a Martin Luther, quickly recanted and submitted; he said he regretted very much that his article, which had been written to serve

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the interests of Catholic theology in Germany, had brought forth conclusions to which, however, he could not submit. So Ehrhard intended to remain a good and faithful son of the Church, always willing to recognize ecclesiastical authority.

Another offender of the radical type who has caused the pope considerable trouble is Professor Josef Schnitzer, of Munich. In him we see the warring of the university professor against the prelate of the hierarchy, of the German against the Roman-Spanish mind. His articles, and especially his book “*Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet?*” (“Did Christ Found the Papacy?”) have given the Vatican a great deal of trouble and heart-ache. Schnitzer, who still holds the position of university professor at Munich under the supervision of the Bavarian Government, and Engert, formerly editor of the *New Century*—since his excommunication studying Protestant theology at Jena—are the only two men among all who protested against “*Pascendi*;” they did not yield to the demands of the Vatican. Schnitzer writes: “The love of Rome for the universi-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

ties and sciences has ever been selfish and Platonic. It has supported the sciences and higher institutions of learning mightily, so long as they served Rome. But Rome immediately changed when the universities wrencheded themselves from Roman tutelage and attempted to stand on their own feet; to-day Rome is indifferent toward the various sciences; they are only welcome when they serve Rome's purpose. Rome fondly imagines it can command the scientist as an incense-bearer. It has no understanding of the fidelity of the scientist to his convictions. From the standpoint of these convictions the Roman Catholic Church can not have an inner relation toward science at all. Based upon her doctrine of being always guided by the Holy Spirit, she has always delighted in the full possession of divine truth. She has from the beginning known everything better than science; she is incapable of fallacies, and not at all dependent upon human science and knowledge. Hence she alone, the Roman Catholic Church, gives the criterion and measure for all sciences and estimates of truth, not only in theological but also in sec-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ular research. All must conform with her doctrines. The scholars may search for years and years, the Roman monsignore decides, even if he understands nothing of the point in question. And justly so. For the scholar will and shall find out what is truth; the monsignore establishes what is ecclesiastical. Roman scholars, the priest, and the faithful are and remain, no matter how long they may live, the simple sheep who could never liberate themselves from the Roman yoke. They constitute the *Ecclesia discens*, which simply hears and obeys. The Holy Spirit is the monopoly of the prelates."

These were plain, outspoken German words, although the language was not Roman Catholic any more. In spite of Schnitzer's keen and sharp words he was not attacked on account of such dissertations, for punishment could be easier applied for other matters. The February (1908) number of the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* published an article, written by Josef Schnitzer, in which he discussed the "Legendenstudien" of Professor Günter, of Tübingen. In his boldness Schnitzer directed the searchlight of his hy-

STRUGGLE OF PIUS X

percritical scrutiny upon the life of Christ as well as upon the life of the Catholic saints, claiming to find legendary traits in the Gospels touching even the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ and the Lord's Supper, and denying the miraculous. The *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* were quickly sent to Rome, his lectures to theologians in the University of Munich were forbidden even, while the students of other faculties flocked to his classroom and gave him tremendous applause. February 6, 1908, he was immediately *a divinis* suspended and disciplined. It is out of question that Schnitzer should ever recant. He is under the protection of the State, still teaching in the university, and the State is not as anxious to dispose of such cases by quickly dismissing the offending teachers as are the ecclesiastical authorities.

IX

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

THE Catholic press on the continent of Europe, among other papers the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, points out to its readers that it was nothing less than an imperative and inevitable duty on the part of the Holy Father to enter upon the warfare against Modernism, a warfare which he is conducting so energetically. The action, of course, was particularly prompted by the developments of recent years in Italy. This paper's information is correct, and undoubtedly inspired from official sources. It also states that there are quite a number of places in Italy where a regular Modernist propaganda is carried on. Societies are formed for that purpose; numerous meetings are held. Modernist systems of study are organized, and every possible effort is made by the promoters of the movement to influence religious thought and general literature. These Mod-

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

ernists, it is stated, deny the authority of the Church and of the pope; they keep printing-presses busy, and send out a large number of pamphlets, which are circulated among the people. "We are glad to be able to say," observes the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, "that there is nothing like this in Germany."

And yet "there is something like that in Germany," taking the latest developments in consideration. And the pope will likewise find it as in his dealings with the men whom he intended to chain to papal assumptions and traditions through an oath against all Modernistic tendencies. These, he will see, are not so easily dealt with; they are Teutons with the spirit of Luther within them. The *Catholic Citizen*, of Milwaukee, rightly thinks that Roman Catholic matters in Europe are likely to be worse before they are better. Yes, even the Catholics of Germany are waking up to the fact that Roman Catholicism—and the emphasis must be placed on "Roman"—has forfeited its opportunity as leader of the modern nations. Catholic ecclesiastical circles have probably never been

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

stirred since the Reformation as they are at the present time over the Anti-Modernist Oath asked by the pope of Catholic priests and teachers.

Two occurrences of vital importance and influence, probably not directly connected with the oath, although greatly influencing sentiment, must be given brief mention in this connection.

The German Emperor went on a visit to his friend, Prince Egon von Fürstenberg, at Donaueschingen. He spent some very pleasant days hunting in the outskirts of the Black Forest. On one of his expeditions the Kaiser called at the neighboring Benedictine Monastery of Beuron, where he partook of some light refreshments and presented the monastery with a metal crucifix. After the presentation the monks, with their abbot at the head, gathered round His Imperial Majesty and listened to a short address. The Kaiser has always admired the Benedictine monks, and whenever he finds himself in the neighborhood of one of their establishments he visits the abbot and speaks words of gracious recognition of the part which the brethren

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

are supposed to have played in the history of Church art and literature.

On this occasion the Kaiser made a speech which has given great satisfaction in Catholic and Ultramontane circles and the greatest dissatisfaction among the ranks of his Protestant subjects. Even the *Reichsbote*, the organ of Prussian Protestant orthodoxy, found fault with His Majesty and blamed him in no uncertain tones for coquetting with monasticism. The journal in question reminded the Kaiser that not so very long ago, in his Borromeo encyclical, the pope bitterly inveighed against the princes of the German Reformation as men without principle, whose god was their belly. The pope has not retracted one word of this libel, and yet the Kaiser goes out of his way to say pleasant things of an order which, as much as any other, is identified with papal pretensions. The Kaiser begged the Abbot of Beuron to help him in endeavoring to retain religion among the people, to help princes and Christian governments to rule in the fear of the Lord, to further the strong religious sentiment implanted in the breasts of Germans,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

and reminded him that Altar and Throne belong to one another and can not be separated. The monks of Beuron were told that the twentieth century had problems to solve which this union of Altar and Throne would do much to facilitate.

One naturally asks what the Kaiser's ally, the King of Italy, has to say to this address of his imperial friend. In Italy there is no apparent union of Altar and Throne, and the only course open to King Victor Emmanuel, if he wishes to bring about this union, is to withdraw from his capitol and leave it in the possession of the Prisoner of the Vatican. The Kaiser, as a student of history, must know perfectly well that no union of Altar and Throne is acceptable to Rome which does not include the supremacy of the pope's throne over all earthly thrones. The Kaiser must also surely know that in the pages of history nothing is written with clearer letters than the fact that where this union has existed the condition of the people has been deplorable and revolution has been the outcome. One has only to reflect on the

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

union of Altar and Throne in France and what it has done for the maintenance of religion in that country. And the recent history of Spain and Portugal affords fresh proofs of the part which the monastic orders have taken in the elevation of nations and in the retention of religion among them.

Another matter must be reviewed for a moment, to which not enough attention has been paid by the world. It is the recent spectacular flight of Prince Max of Saxony and his forced recantation of his challenge of the Roman Catholic claims at the feet of the pope. Prince Max of Saxony is a younger brother of the king of that land. He has been a Jesuit priest since 1896, and for the last five years has held the important office of professor of Common Law and Liturgy at the Swiss University of Freiburg. Extremely gentle and affable in his manners, he has ever enjoyed popularity, especially among the poor, to whom much of his time had been devoted. He began his ecclesiastical career as a parish priest, and worked for some months among the poor of the East

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

End of London. He is now a tertiary of the great Dominican Order, and has always been known as a strong rock of orthodoxy.

This royal priest has been deeply interested for some time in the union of the Eastern and Western branches of the Catholic Church. So he has made a journey to Athens, Constantinople, and the great monastic establishment of Mount Athos, with the object of studying the situation and getting in contact with the leaders of the Eastern Church, or, as the *Catholic News* (January 14, 1911) says, to study "the delicate question of the return of the Greek Church to the true fold." His studies were in the field of Church history, and, as a man of undoubted learning, he conversed at length with the scholars of that ancient Greek monastery and delved deeply in the untrammelled field of history. On his way home he lectured on his experiences; the prince rather made fun of those Greek and Russian monks hiding there among the rocks of Athos. These lectures, however, did not seem to have brought him reproof or correction, probably because they were confined to the monks of the Greek

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

Church. Had they been Roman Catholic monks, Prince Max's freedom of speech would undoubtedly soon have been curtailed.

When he had returned to his college he wrote an article setting forth the grounds upon which hopes might be entertained for reuniting these long divided branches of the Church. This article was published in a Catholic periodical entitled *Rome and the Orient*, edited by a monk of St. Basil, the Abbot of Pellegrini. The article is chiefly occupied in removing the hindrances to the union of the Oriental and Occidental Churches. It has caused a storm of indignation in Roman circles, and has also caused the Vatican to summon the illustrious priest to Rome, there to give an explanation of his conduct and to recant his views. Prince Max expressed views in this article which are so utterly at variance with the accepted papal teachings that an able writer says it is the most formidable attack of recent years on the pretensions of the papacy and its claim to infallibility.

What, then, are the views published by this German ecclesiastical prince? First, he

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

says that throughout the controversy between the two Churches the Roman popes have insisted upon the supremacy of their establishment and on the subordinate position of the Eastern patriarchs. Popes, like Innocent III, Nicholas I, and Leo IX, have insisted on this view. It is a view, however, says Prince Max, which must be given up if union is to be established. A primacy at Rome can not be maintained. Equally clear is Prince Max's remark about the temporal power. The temporal power is of modern invention, unknown to the early Church, and only maintained on the questionable authority of false credentials. This is the view which only a few years ago was described as accursed by Pope Leo XIII.

Prince Max is equally explicit concerning his views on the dogma. If Rome desires union with the Eastern patriarchs, there must be no insistence on those particular and peculiar dogmas and rites "fabricated" by the Roman Church alone, and introduced after the disruption. Not only the primacy of Rome must be abandoned, but the peculiar coloring given to the doctrine of the

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

purgatory, the transubstantiation, and confirmation must not be insisted upon. He declared that the claim to infallibility was likewise a modern invention which would have to be given up, since it stood squarely in the way of union. On these dogmas the Oriental Church has its own views, and liberty must be given to it to retain them. The belief in the Immaculate Conception of Mary was not held or recognized by the saints of the earliest times. The Apostle Paul must be given a place of authority, equal to that held by St. Peter. On the general question of union, says the prince, there must be no forcing of the Eastern Churches to accept the Roman standards either of polity or dogma; there must also be no insisting on contributions of money from the East to the West for the support of peculiarly Western institutions.

But he did not stop there; for he also touched the subjects of the Crusades and showed how they were to some extent the expeditions of robbers, and how the popes had been eaten up with the lust of power, rather than the passion for feeding the flock of Christ. Trickery had been resorted to by

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

certain popes to deceive the Eastern Churches, and certain councils could not be regarded as ecumenical. All this is a body blow to the claims of the Church of Rome to-day; it is a piece of Modernism, pure and simple.

Briefly, this is the substance of the famous article written by this bold Saxon priest. Indeed, he shattered the clay feet of the image and challenged the imposture to come out into the daylight of the world's public opinion when he formidably attacked the hollow claims to infallibility. As soon as the article was published every effort was made by the Vatican authorities to suppress the magazine in which it had appeared. Copies were bought up at any price and destroyed. Scarcely one is now in existence. Hastily Prince Max was sent for. It was soon made known by the Vatican authorities "that he is ready to retract all errors pointed out to him by the Holy See." (*Catholic News*, New York, January 14, 1911.) The papal epistle to the Eastern Churches states that Prince Maximilian in the presence of the pope solemnly undertook to teach, reject,

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

and condemn what the Church teaches, rejects, and condemns. It characterizes his article as inconsiderate, but written in good faith. Twelve hours after the prince had been kneeling before the pope, asking forgiveness and retracting all he had said, the pope's letter to his bishops condemning the prince's heresies had been issued and was on its way to all four quarters of the world. Probably never before had there been such a haste at the Vatican.

Although the Vatican has dealt successfully with far stronger natures than that of the prince—and we greatly regret the course of the prince—yet no one believes in Prince Max's recantation. He is a man of science, and his conclusions were arrived at after years of patient study. He has not really yielded up his belief. All he has done is to give his master, the pope, a salve to apply to anxious spirits throughout the Church. It is the opinion of a great many careful watchers in the Catholic and Protestant Churches in Europe that the foundations of the Church of Rome are being surely sapped, and, to change the figure, cracks are begin-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ning to appear in the clay feet of the colossus. Of course, it is now impossible to obtain a copy of the periodical in which the prince's article had appeared, and, judging by the fresh light thrown on the article by the European press, the prince is a Modernist of the blackest type.

In the Saxon home of the prince the incident has created most profound excitement. The Catholic House of Wettin, which rules in the Protestant land of Saxony, has no sympathies to spare for the Vatican or the ways of the Vatican. This was shown rather effectively recently when the King of Saxony sent his famous protest to Rome against the language of the late Borromeo encyclical. The king himself is said to be in no way attached to Rome or the Roman confession, and in the capitol of Dresden rumor is persistent that the drastic treatment which Prince Max has suffered at the hands of the Vatican will move the king one step further in the direction of secession, to follow the example of his Protestant forebears of the glorious Reformation. The Vatican surely should know, if past experiences are not ut-

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

terly forgotten, that among the proud, straight-forward, unbending Saxons the spirit of Martin Luther still lives and moves.

Now, it might too commonly be supposed that Modernism stands for a violent and bitter attack upon the authenticity and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and one readily allows that the great number of books and pamphlets which have fallen in recent years upon France and Italy especially would be sufficient to justify such an opinion. But it should be remembered that Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church means in reality no more than an examination of the Christian faith; that is, to separate out of the theological dogma what is merely legendary and traditional. It is therefore not always the most reckless and actually unscientific criticism; for many of the so-called heretics are most reverently and devoutly searching the Scriptures to see what is fundamentally the "hope of salvation." As we have seen, His Holiness Pope Pius X, who is simply the nominal head of the Vatican and surrounded by his Latin advisers, has experienced considerable trouble with the offenders in Italy,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

France, Germany, and England. He deemed it wise and necessary, from the Ultramontane standpoint, to use partly inquisitorial methods in dealing with the offenders. Some yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon them, while others would never betray the dictum of their conscience and would rather live under the ban of excommunication for the rest of their lives.

In order to stem the tide, which is growing very rapidly—as the Latin countries are in almost open revolt against the Vatican, and Rome in many quarters is fighting for its life with its back to the wall—the Holy Father has sent out to the Catholic clergy in Europe and America a circular, requiring all priests to take an oath against Modernistic doctrine. Here is a translation of it:

“I accept and firmly embrace everything that has been defined by the unerring magisterium of the Church, whatever has been declared and promulgated, especially those doctrines which are directed against present-day errors.

“In the first place, I profess that God, the beginning and end of all things, can by

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

the natural light of reason be known and even demonstrated through those things which have been created; namely, the visible works of nature, as a cause through its effects.

“Secondly, I hold and admit that the external arguments of revelation, namely, divine works, especially miracles and prophecies, as most sure signs of a Christian religion divinely established, and I hold those same things to be true for all ages and men, even of our own time, and that they are strictly conformable to reason.

“Thirdly, I firmly believe that the Church, the custodian and teacher of the revealed Word, through the very historic Christ, when He lived among us, was proximately and directly instituted, and this same Church was founded upon Peter, the prince of the apostolic hierarchy, and his successors to last for ever.

“Fourthly, I sincerely accept the doctrine of faith in its entirety as it has been transmitted to our times by orthodox preachers; and, moreover, I entirely reject the heretical dictum of the evolution of dogmas of those who transfer the meaning of those dogmas from one sense to another, differing entirely from that held previously by the Church.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

“Fifthly, I hold as most certain and sincerely profess that faith is not a blind result of a religious breaking forth from a darkened subconsciousness, and proceeding from the heart and flexible will alone, but which is conformable to reason and has been revealed by a personal God, our Creator and Lord; and we believe it to be true, because of the authority of God, who is eminently truthful.

“I firmly believe and with due reverence submit to all the condemnations and declarations which are contained in the encyclical letters, ‘Pascendi,’ and the decree ‘Lamentabili,’ especially concerning that which they term dogmatic history.

“I likewise reject the error of those that affirm that the faith proposed by the Church is repugnant to history, and that Catholic tenets, in the sense in which they are now understood, can not be reconciled with more reliable origins of the Christian religion. I likewise condemn the opinion of those who maintain that the learned Christian man possesses a double personality—the one a believer, the other an historian.

“I disregard also that system of interpreting Sacred Scripture which prefers the methods of rationalists to the tradition of

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

the Church, the doctrines of the faith, and the rules of the Apostolic See.

“Finally and in a word, I profess myself opposed to the error of the Modernists who hold that there is nothing divine in sacred tradition or, what is still worse, admitted in a Pantheistic sense, so that nothing remains of it but the bare and simple fact, just as is the case of other historical facts.

“I promise that I shall faithfully and in the sincerity of my heart observe all these, never deviating from them in any way, either in teaching or in word and writing. So I promise, so I swear.”

The priests of the Catholic world have taken this stringent oath. The matter was completed throughout the world before the 31st of December, 1910. The secular press commented upon the matter, but gave rather meager accounts of it, for not all of the facts were given. Considering the condition in France, for instance, we find that some priests gave only outer assent to the oath, while reserving the right to go on reading the books of this generation, notwithstanding their outward, formal, and oathbound

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

declaration to the contrary. The reader may draw his own conclusions concerning the essential character of the clerical training and conscience of the French priests in a joint letter written by priests in every diocese in France and sent to every bishop. This letter elevated perjury to a virtue; its morality is horrible. It plainly shows the widespread disaffection Pius X is trying so desperately to crush. Dr. Paul Hyacinthe Loysen, son of Father Loysen, said of this letter, "Nobler words were never used to express the determination to commit an infamous action."

Here follows a translation of the joint letter of the French priests to their bishops:

"YOUR LORDSHIP: Profoundly convinced that the Church should not be identified with the Curia and the Roman congregations; that the law of nature allows no man to tyrannize over conscience; that religion is not produced by the bludgeon, and that a stroke of the pen does not suffice to deprive a priest of the rights which his manhood, his baptism, and his ordination give him;

"Moved to sorrow by an oath which mingles together both revealed doctrines and purely human opinions, and yet demands our

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

complete and unqualified assent; recognizing in this demand a measure which would destroy all liberty among the faithful, and all sense of self-respect among the priests; convinced that a majority of Catholics, led astray by a press whose bidding for favor has no limits, and whose servility has no bounds, are too terrorized by threats to comprehend the necessity of legitimate protest; wishing to remain in the Church because they believe in it and because they love it, because it is their Father's house and because their remaining in it is an indestructible obstacle to the establishment of absolute despotism; acting, moreover, upon the example—approved by the highest religious authority—of those members of religious orders who, whenever a civil law appears to them unjust, never hesitate to affirm before our courts what is contrary to truth, on the ground that their action does not bind them but is merely an external gesture, a mere formality;

“Knowing, finally, that according to the recent decision of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, September 25, 1910, each case of refusal to take this oath must be sent for judgment to the Inquisition—a tribunal which has blundered often in the past, and can blunder again in the present and the future, but which admits no appeal from its

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

sentence and never retracts error, even when the error is a condemnation of the motion of the earth—a tribunal which makes the outrageous claim of judging with hearing and without even telling a man of what he is accused;

“Having also read in these same decisions that ecclesiastical superiors are forbidden to give letters of recommendation to such of their subordinates as have been refused permission to preach in any place; that bishops and pastors are likewise prohibited from inviting to the pulpit any preacher who has been reproved by a prelate; and that in consequence the honor and even the daily bread of a priest are placed at the mercy of possible personal spite, and may be sacrificed to an inculpable mistake;

“For all these reasons, and others too numerous to mention, a body of priests belonging to every diocese in France have determined to give merely external submission to the decree ‘*Sacrorum Antistitum*,’ and at present, and also for the future, if similar circumstances should arise, to go through the formality of the oath.

“But before submitting to this tyranny they wish to protest before God, before the Church, and before your lordship that this act does not bind them in conscience and does

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

not in the least imply a change in their ideas; that they remain to-day what they were yesterday; and that, reserving their interior, complete, and absolute assent for that alone which is essential to faith, they will, for all the rest, confine themselves, so far as they can, to respectful silence.”

The contrast to the attitude of the French priests can be clearly seen in the treatment the pope’s demand received by certain brave Italian priests. A recent case will illustrate this point. Don Luigi Fontana, of Palazzola, near Milan, in a meeting convened for the priests in that district, objected to this new imposition, affirming that he did not believe the exercise of his own judgment on certain Modernist questions was incompatible with a profession of the Christian faith or the fundamental precepts of the Church. Consequently his case was given to Cardinal Ferrari, of Milan, who rated him soundly for venturing even to question the orders of the Vatican given out by the Holy Father. The young obstinate priest was immediately suspended; the cardinal granted him two days to reconsider the matter and repent. Fon-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tana's answer was also immediately forthcoming. Here is a copy of the letter he sent to the cardinal at the expiration of the time:

“YOUR EMINENCE: I can not take the oath, save at the expense of a liberty which I can not relinquish. What you call the pride of a ‘good-for-nothing young man’ is, as far as I am concerned, a simple act of honesty. Sincerity, which seems to count for nothing with ecclesiastical authorities, my conscience tells me, is the first of all virtues and the foundation of a moral life. Consequently I prefer to suffer any sacrifice which my refusal to take the oath may entail, rather than commit moral suicide, which would rob me of all peace during the rest of my life.

“Devoutly yours,
“(Signed) LUIGI FONTANA.”

Fontana is only twenty-seven years old, is well educated, a fluent speaker, sympathetic, and of deep religious sentiment. It appears that it is not his intention to enter the active ministry, as he prefers to take a literary diploma in the university, with the view of securing a government professorship and devoting himself to education.

Another case of greater importance and

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

exceptional gravity is the recent desertion from the bosom of the Roman Church of Monsignore Giobbio, as he is a very intimate friend of Cardinal Merry del Val, the pope's secretary of State, who figured conspicuously in the limelight of the Roosevelt-Fairbanks incident. Monsignore Giobbio was professor of Ecclesiastical Law in the Academy for Ecclesiastics drawn from the nobility, also private chaplain to the pope, and under secretary of the Congregation of the "Regolari." He had been sent recently as apostolic visitor to reorganize the theological studies in various provinces in Sicily. He is well known among Catholic and Protestant theologians by his three volumes of lectures on "Ecclesiastical Diplomacy" and his volume on "Conciliation." These documents are held in high repute. This noted man, after many years of service, now feels constrained to abandon the Church of Rome for a life more in harmony with the dictum of reason and conscience. His Holiness undoubtedly suffered many pangs in throwing this weed over the Vatican's wall.

The situation in Germany among the Ro-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

man clergy is probably of a more serious nature at present than in any other country. Signs are becoming visible on all sides that the wise men of the Vatican, and especially the Italian advisers of the pope, have made a profound and rather serious mistake in their attempts to impose the Anti-Modernist Oath on German priests and on the Catholic clergy filling theological chairs in German universities. It was reported in March, 1911, that twenty-four priests had openly decided not to take this oath. But how many had declined in private to take it is not known and never will be known. Of the twenty-four, fourteen belong to Bavaria; the other ten are either Prussians or belong to South German States. These men by their courageous action deprived themselves of all means of livelihood, and some of them have been obliged to beg the assistance of benevolent funds to which they had formerly subscribed. In one very sad case a priest who was not entitled to the benefits of the fund worked on the streets of Munich fourteen days, reports a European paper, shoveling snow. It is not only among the priests that this movement

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

has set in against the oath. In four seminaries for the training of priests a number of the students have left the institutions on the ground that the taking of the oath by their preceptors means an infringement of their liberty as scientific theologians.

Here follows the confession of a German priest who has taken the oath against his own conviction, as he writes in the *Neue Jahrhundert*, 1911, No. 2; he gives his name as a Roman priest who would like to be a German priest: "I have also taken the oath. With a wounded soul, obeying necessity. Necessity? Yes, I must consider my relatives and close friends; in old age one can not select another calling, even if one is not in poor circumstances. Who could with an easy heart liberate himself from everything? Oh, it was a hard struggle within me. My conscience was fighting against the brutal power of intellectual suppression. Can a man ever stand before God who has forbidden his fellow-men to think? The thoughts come, whether they should or not; worse than that, doubts come, and the suppression of intellectual freedom increases such doubts. Yet

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the awful hour is past, only there rests upon me an awful dream. But I have found one comfort, one ray of hope fell in the encircling gloom. While I took the oath Christ stood before me with His look of compassion. I saw that He would pardon my sin which I was forced to commit against Him. I have heard Him say: 'My son, thy sins are forgiven thee. Truth is on its way.' " This troubled priest closed his confession with an appeal to the State, which should protect the priests against the foreign despotic interference of the Roman hierarchy. An old priest of Augsburg has published an open letter to the pope in the *Augsburger Post-zeitung*, which has been reproduced in many journals throughout the country. Among other things he says: "Jesus Christ Himself did not punish with expulsion those of His apostles who doubted. Holy Father, I am a servant of God, and wish to continue so. I swear with all my heart to respect the truth; but I can not call God to witness that in the future I will always hold as truth that which you to-day seek to impose upon me. It would imply the renunciation of every human

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

writing, and even the teaching of the Apostle Paul himself, who wrote, ‘Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.’ ”

When the pope demanded the oath of his priests, wherein these points are: first, the supernatural element in religion; second, the Divinity of Christ; third, the establishment of the Church by the apostles, and fourth, the sacredness of the traditions of the Church,—he expected that the circular of September 25, 1910, would be sufficient. But in order that some offenders might not escape, another circular has been sent out later throughout Europe, requiring all clerical professors in colleges and all priests who have the cure of souls not simply to take an oath against Modernistic doctrine, but, as if to make it more binding, to sign a document to that effect. It had hitherto been supposed, it seems, that priests who are professors in universities or teachers in other State institutions would be excused from taking the oath. And an exemption does, indeed, apply to priests who are professors exclusively; but nearly all of these professors are also preachers and confessors in the dioceses

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

where they live, or are members of ecclesiastical bodies of some sort. Besides the Vatican made it plain that it did not look with favor on those professors who would take advantage of the exemption. In his letter to Cardinal Fischer, of Cologne, the pope admits that it may be necessary to suspect the orthodoxy of those taking such advantage, but "assuredly they show a lamentable dependence upon the opinions of men in that they cowardly do homage to the authority of those who, not of conviction, but out of hatred for the Catholic religion, proclaim that the oath offends against the dignity of human reason and checks progress in the sciences." In these words the Protestant feeling of Germany, as well as the historical sense of German scholarship, are grievously affronted, and undoubtedly the letter has appreciably darkened the prospects of religious peace.

The last circular has raised a storm of opposition in clerical circles. Even the *Kölner Volkszeitung*, which has always been a defender of Roman methods, refused to be consoled, when it said, "It is not too late to

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

reply to this high-handed policy, 'Thus far and no farther.' "

Perhaps of the greatest importance and significance was the determined attitude assumed by the professors in the colleges in Württemberg, Bavaria, Monaco, and other places. Hugo Koch, with his "Cyprian and the Roman Primate," and Josef Schnitzer, with his "Did Christ Found the Papacy?" are by no means alone. Others who were affected by the last circular issued by the Vatican with its Italian advisers, are now fighting the battle. We mention only a few of the offenders, noted scholars of Germany. The rebellion is open, and it seems to be daily growing in volume. Many German professors refused most emphatically to subscribe to the Anti-Modernist Oath. Most significant is undoubtedly the refusal of Professor Leonhard Atzberger, instructor in Dogmatic Theology at the University of Munich. He has been an influential scholar in the Roman Church, was promoted to the full professorship in 1894, and has written "Der Glaube," "Die Logoslehre des heiligen Athanasius," "Handbuch der katholischen

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Dogmatik," and a number of other noted works. It must also be remembered that Dr. Atzberger holds a high position in the Archepiscopal Council. Other distinguished recalcitrant professors are Professor Knopfer, Professor Gieti, Dr. Walter, Professor Gottberger. These men are united in their determination to resist to the death this attack on their liberty of conscience. Besides these and many others, the young priests in the Seminary of San Gaetano, at Monaco, have refused to take the oath.

More recent news from Germany shows that the defections in the Roman Catholic Church exceed the most pessimistic forecast and assume proportions truly alarming to the Vatican. Throughout Baden, and more especially in Freiburg, it is reported on good authority, not one of the professors or priests has consented to take the Anti-Modernist Oath, and the time limit fixed for doing so has long passed. In other States the resisters are increasing in numbers. The ecclesiastical authorities in Rome maintained a very suggestive silence on the matter and sought to hide from the public the grave

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

crisis brought about by the pope's action; but information will ooze out. One Catholic organ, wishing to make light of the matter, declared that the result of the circular may be regarded as one of the victories of the policy pursued by Pius X (victory forsooth!) in that it has enabled the Holy See to find out who among the Roman clergy are tainted with Modernist error. The journal goes on to say that His Holiness will now be able to weed his garden and throw over the wall the noxious plants that disfigure it. But here is another side of the question. Rome is losing her choicest sons, those who stand for intelligence and culture and all that is spiritual. It is a struggle of darkness and superstition against the incoming of light. It is a determined fight for freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, and there can be no doubt as to the issue. It is all nonsense talking about the pope weeding his garden! When wise men weed their gardens they do not pluck up the flowers. The papacy did that very thing in the sixteenth century, with a result known to all students of history, and if the same course is followed in the twen-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tieth, the result, as far as the Roman Church is concerned, will be far more disastrous.

Still more significant is the aroused opposition against the Vatican in quarters yet more important—a determined opposition which can not but entail the gravest consequences for the Roman Church in Germany. At Leipzig, in a congress of professors connected with the various German universities, a very serious deliberation took place. At its close a motion was passed unanimously to exclude from the teaching staff any professor who may have signed the oath against Modernism, on the simple ground that such an act is degrading to reason and altogether incompatible with a free and sincere examination of the scientific problems of the age.

Even the editors of Catholic newspapers in Germany had been notified that they will be expected to write according to the Vatican's precepts. A long list of instructions has been sent out to them in which the duties of a faithful editor are carefully explained. He is not to permit the expression of any heretical views in his paper. He is likewise not permitted to say a word of praise about

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

any writer who assails directly or indirectly the doctrines of the Church. He is not to criticise or call in question the authority of the pope or of the Catholic bishops. He is to advocate in season or out of season the temporal authority of the pope, and to continue to point out to the faithful the terrible condition of the pope in his imprisonment.

Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg admitted in the Prussian Diet that "profound emotion had been aroused in Germany by the decrees recently issued by the Vatican." He pointed out that the State had nothing to do with the religious affairs of the people, but when subscription to or refusal to subscribe to an oath affected the position of members of the Roman Catholic faculties at the universities or of Roman Catholic teachers in the State schools, the State must defend itself. Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg said that if the Vatican had informed the Prussian Government beforehand of its intention to issue these decrees, attention could have been drawn to the consequent danger of such action and the present con-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

flicts might have been averted. Seeing that the Vatican did not adopt such a plan, it must now take full responsibility for the effect produced by the decrees in Germany. In respect to counter-measures the minister-president declined to consider the suggestion that the Roman Catholic faculties at the universities should be dissolved, but he expressed a decided opinion that the Roman Catholic clergy and teachers who had given instructions in State schools as teachers of German and of history—hitherto to the satisfaction of the government—could not do this after they had subscribed to the Anti-Modernist Oath. The decision implied in von Bethmann-Hollweg's statement is of far-reaching importance, for it also effects the appointment of district inspectors of schools, and the threat to carry it into force may suffice. Taken as a whole, the speech of the minister-president was an emphatic exhortation and warning to the Vatican, and an intimation that Prussia has decided to stand her ground, and to fight to maintain it if compelled to do so by the Vatican.

The Prussian ambassador at Rome called

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

attention to the danger of a disturbance of the cordial relations then existing between his country and the Vatican if the oath should be insisted upon in relation to the Catholic professors of Theology in Prussian universities. Cardinal Fischer, however, was later able in his tactful way to persuade the pope that for Germany the application of the oath required some modifications and concessions. It had been pointed out, especially by Protestants, that the pope's policy in the different German States strongly tended to bring about a separation of Church and State. The governments of most of the German States either already have declared or are manifestly about to declare that it would be intolerable for the professors to be thus limited in their freedom; in particular, to be required to submit the texts of their lectures to the bishops.

What course will the Vatican, with its nominal head, Pope Pius X, adopt in the future in regard to these rebellious priests? This question arises in many minds. Will the obstinate priests be removed from their posts and incur severe ecclesiastical punish-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ment? Schnitzer, Koch, and Engert, also many others, know only too well what that means. Will the pope persist in his demands? Should he persist, considering the number and quality of the offenders, the Vatican will certainly have to face a grave catastrophe in Germany. The situation is extremely delicate and full of peril. Should the Vatican be unaware and blind as to the spirit of the times? Nobody in Prussia or in Germany is thirsting for a "Kulturkampf." German Catholics and Protestants desire peace, and the Vatican should show adequate knowledge and due consideration for the situation there. The pope has repeatedly assured the German Government that he earnestly desired the maintenance of peaceful relations between the Church and the State. This desire, however, was frustrated when there are promulgations like the Borromeo encyclical or decrees like the recent decrees, which may find a foundation in other countries, but in Germany give grave offense. As to the situation created by the exaction of the oath, the government would deal with it according to circumstances, taking care that

THE ANTI-MODERNIST OATH

the rights of the State were respected, but not unduly interfering with those who had taken it, so long as they gave no offense and were not engaged in teaching subjects such as the German language and history, which could not be entrusted to those who had bound themselves by the oath.

The Vatican surely knows, if past experiences are not fully forgotten, that among these proud, straight-forward, unbending Teutons the spirit of the Reformation still lives and moves, and yet Rome very carelessly plays with fire. These Latin councilors within the walls of the Vatican continue intransigent even in the face of the dictates of prudence and common sense. Will the papal conclave advise the Holy Father to maintain his intransigent policy? Or will he temporize in these cases, as he did when confronted with the protests of the French prelates touching the inadvisability of lowering the age for taking the first communion? This is the question uppermost in many minds to-day. Should he in the future decide utterly to disregard the spirit of the times, then the bark will steadily but surely

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

and inevitably head for the rocks. The prestige of the Roman Catholic Church among modern scholars is gone, to a large extent, and the final result can be easily foreseen. The attitude which the Protestant Church in this crisis should assume is clear. We must perform our duty toward all and labor so that these illustrious professors and conscientious priests may steadily move toward the clearer light of Biblical Christianity.

X

THE UNITED STATES

LESS than a year before his death Father George Tyrrell said, concerning Modernism in America: "I can not understand America. With its freedom and intelligence, its representatives ought to be in the forefront of the Modernist movement. Yet Modernism has produced there hardly an echo. The Church in America is asleep." Other leading Modernists of Europe have expressed a like disappointment. On a visit to this country the scholarly Frenchman Albert Houtin said that Roman Catholicism in America was all but blind to one of the most momentous movements of Christian history. Loisy in his mild way has wondered at the lack of intellectual activity among American Catholics, while Albert Ehrhard has expressed himself on the subject in terms of summary contempt, declaring in substance that the Church of Rome in America has yet to show the first sign of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the possession of scholarship in the face of modern problems. A book, written by an American priest and published in 1910, under the title "Letters to His Holiness, Pope Pius X," (by a Modernist; Chicago, Open Court Publishing Company, 1910), attempts to tell why Americans have taken so small part in the movement. First, Modernism is largely intellectual, and "the Church in this country is intellectually backward." This priest declares that in all the voluminous literature of Biblical criticism, history, and philosophy "not a single work of competence and authority has yet been produced by an American Catholic, and the books that reach the second class are hardly more than a dozen." The Catholic University at Washington "has only a handful of students." Secondly, he states, as charged at a meeting of Catholic educators in Milwaukee, "the men sent up to the seminaries by Catholic colleges are in a condition of almost scandalous unfitness for prosecuting the higher studies of an ecclesiastical course, unable to grasp the problem, incapable of thinking for themselves."

THE UNITED STATES

The form of Modernism that has appeared in America is what Pope Leo XIII condemned as "Americanism," which is described by the able German professor, Karl Holl of Berlin, in his pamphlet on "Modernismus" as initiative, activity, the significance of personality, an emphasis on the active virtues in contrast with those that are passive. Holl's insight in this characterization is considerable. American independence will gradually do for the Roman Catholic Church in America what Modernism in its more scholarly phases is accomplishing in Europe.

When the International Congress of Catholic Scholars met at Freiburg, Switzerland, August 16-20, 1897, for its fourth session, Mgr. O'Connell, rector of the American College at Rome, delivered an address on the new ideas and the life of Father Hecker. And then for the first time larger circles within the Catholic Church were made acquainted with the new intellectual movement known as "Americanism." Who was Father Hecker? What was his aim? What were the essential phases of Americanism?

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Isaac Thomas Hecker was born of German Evangelical Lutheran parents on December 18, 1819, in New York City, where he also died December 22, 1888. He became an advocate of the principles of the Workingmen's party, and was led into sympathy with the Transcendalist movement. In 1843 he entered the community at Brook Farm, but failed to find himself in harmony with the community, and within a year went to the similar community at Fruitlands, where he felt still less at home. In August, 1843, he returned to New York and entered business with his brothers in the manufacture of flour, but only for a year. The quest after God had seized his heart. He had long been drawn toward the Catholic Church, and after many inward struggles and a searching investigation of the claims of the Protestant denominations he became, August 1, 1844, a convert to Roman Catholicism. Protestantism, with its many-sided phases, appeared to him too individualistic, and did not seem to answer his longings. But the practical sense of mutual participation and the conformity of the Catholic Church attracted

THE UNITED STATES

him, although he was not at all familiar with the doctrines and the rites of Roman Catholicism; the solid and firm organization seemed to assure him of the truth of the Roman Church. He had been seeking after truth, not especially its form or color.

Before his "conditional baptism in the Catholic Church, which took place August 1, 1844, although he had been baptized in infancy by a Lutheran minister, he went to Concord, Mass., to study, but soon returned to New York. Six weeks after his conversion, as it had been his determination to enter the Redemptionist Order, he went with two other American converts to the Redemptionist Monastery at St. Tron, Belgium. Here he lived two years in voluntary rigorous asceticism; in 1846 he took his vows. He then studied at Wittem, Holland (1846-1848), and Clapham, England (1848-1849), and in 1849 was ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Wiseman. It had been rather difficult for him to comprehend scholasticism during the years of his study. He gained, however, the confidence of his superiors by advocating the idea constantly that God had appointed

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

him to win America for the Roman Catholic Church. After a year in mission work Hecker returned to the United States early in 1851. On his voyage to this country he worked very hard for the conversion of a sailor, the only person on the ship receptive of his work. For a number of years the authorities of the Catholic Church engaged him to lecture at their special mission meetings for the people, his addresses being confined mostly to dogmatic and ethical themes. In such work he labored until 1857, particularly in the Eastern part of the United States, although this work never fully satisfied him, as it had been his desire to win Protestant America to Catholicism. In order to place his special mission work before the people he entered the journalistic field and wrote two books on "Questions of the Soul," also "Aspirations of Nature." These books were to prove that the Roman Catholic Church possessed everything to satisfy the moral and intellectual wants of humanity. In 1857 Hecker and four other American Redemptionsists requested the "Congregation" to re-organize Catholic mission work and also or-

THE UNITED STATES

ganize a headquarter or house in the American province of the order, where English should be spoken exclusively. This request was immediately refused; so Hecker went in the name and commission of his friends to the superior of the order at Rome. Being branded as disobedient, he was expelled from the Congregation on simply a technical violation of his vows. However, Pope Pius IX and a number of the prelates were friendly toward Hecker; so on March 8, 1858, he received honorable discharge from the Order of the Redemptionists. He likewise received the permission by the pope to found the "Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle" (usually called the Paulist Fathers). In 1859 the foundation of the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, which still remains the center of the activity of the Paulist Fathers, was laid in New York City. The greater part of the remainder of his life was to be devoted to the upbuilding of his congregation and the furtherance of its aims. From 1871 until his death Hecker was an invalid. The object of the order was the conversion of Protestants, and it was very successfully

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

carried out; he was the soul of the enterprise. Yet it was charged against him that he presented those doctrines which were common to both branches of the Christian Church or which were likely to win the acceptance of Protestants more emphatically than strictly Roman Catholic teaching. This course was condemned by Leo XIII, when it was called to his attention by means of the Italian translation of Father Hecker's life, and led to his writing to the United States prelates a severe letter condemning this method of presenting the Church doctrine which he styled "Americanism."

The original five men who constituted the "Congregation of Missionary Priests of St. Paul" were Clarence Walworth and Francis Baker, both former Episcopalian clergymen; Augustine Hewitt, who had previously passed from Congregationalism to the Episcopalian Church; George Deshon, a graduate of West Point, where he had been a classmate of General Grant, and Isaac T. Hecker. The two cardinal points insisted upon as embodying the fundamental spirit of the new foundation were the personal perfection of

THE UNITED STATES

the members and zeal for souls; and, in connection with the latter, special stress was laid on the hoped-for conversion of the people of the United States to the Roman Catholic faith through the apostolic labors of the missionaries. Another fundamental characteristic of the new community is worthy of note. While other congregations laid the main stress on fidelity to the rules and exercises of community life as the most important element, the Paulists give the element of personal individuality the first place, and give it free scope as far as is consistent with the exigencies of the common life. In accordance with these general principles and avowed intentions, the activity of the Paulist Fathers has radicated in various directions. They not only accomplished mission work throughout the country among Catholics and non-Catholics, and gave special attention in their churches to the proper carrying out of the liturgical services—and in particular to the reform of ecclesiastical music, so that they organized choirs of men and boys and promoted congregational singing—but they have also been strenuous and consistent advocates

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

of temperance. Their propaganda in favor of sobriety has been exerted through sermons, tracts, articles in their own publications, and letters to the public press; through petitions to the Legislatures and action at the polls; through the formation of total abstinence societies, and through the establishment of the Temperance Publication Bureau with its periodical entitled *Temperance Truth*. In 1910, besides the mother house, church, school, etc., in New York, and a house of studies at the Catholic University in Washington, the Paulists had stations established in San Francisco, Chicago, Winchester, Tenn.; Berkely, Cal.; and Austin, Tex. In the last two named towns the Paulist communities were established chiefly in the interests of the Roman Catholic students who attend the State universities there located. The Congregation has a total of sixty-four fathers, twenty-one students, and ten postulants.

The missionary work, as stated above, owes its existence to Father Isaac T. Hecker; it was his special "American" idea. Hecker always appeared, even in the most insignifi-

THE UNITED STATES

cant externals—as to his clothes and beard, for instance—as a genuine American. His heart was overflowing with love for his country and its people. But Catholics, especially many priests, had come to America from foreign lands, not feeling the responsibility of true American citizens. Yet the American Constitution, with its ecclesiastical neutrality of the States and the unconditional freedom of the individual, as well as the freedom of human society, serves the promulgation of Catholicism better than does the ecclesiasticism of the State Church of the Old World. Catholics, however, should adopt and adapt themselves to the American spirit, and not saturate American institutions with the spirit of Rome which gravely concerns many thoughtful citizens at the present time. But the spirit of America is a spirit of freedom, liberty, and personal conviction; and this right of freedom of conscience must be recognized by the Church and should consequently be executed. So the prisoner at the Vatican and his Italian advisers, who are probably not at all familiar with our conditions, will do well to let America work out

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

her own salvation. Only then can Catholicism be a power for the best interests of the American people.

The Church could have easily permitted Hecker to work in the spirit and apply the methods in which he had begun without condemning him. If it is God's will that the natural conditions and needs of humanity should undergo a change from generation to generation, then this same God will likewise permit the Church to change her methods in offering eternal salvation to erring sinners of the present age, provided these religious demands are presented in the spirit of the gospel, clear and forceful, and with unction; not in the sense that old and well-tried also universally adopted Church methods can become obsolete, but in the other sense, that such a method can easily give way to new ones with our changing conditions and wonderful progress. Our century grants to man in every direction more liberty than previous centuries; he must, therefore, make use of his personality and latent powers; this liberty of conscience must consequently take not only the leadership in life, but also in the

THE UNITED STATES

religious demands of the Church. An iron-clad ancient discipline and uniformity can not take the place of inner virtues, nor can obedience toward the external and foreign authority of a Church supply the power of the Holy Spirit which rests in every regenerated soul. Differences here which must surely and naturally follow should not frighten men. Johannes Kübel says concerning Hecker's work in this respect: "No two noses are alike in every detail, and so not even two souls. God never repeats Himself; the Eternal Absolute God creates continually new forms to impress Himself. So Hecker believed that his principle of freedom would promptly harmonize with the authority of the Roman Church, although he plainly stated that only the man who yields in the realm of dogma to the authority of the Church possesses the Holy Spirit in the true sense of the word." Dogma and hierarchy were always self-evident for Hecker, yet he never cared a great deal for either; with him everything depended on religion. According to his ideas a corps of free men, who would love God with their own free will above all

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

things, could be the only means to hurriedly conquer this world.

Hecker in his "Congregation of Missionary Priests of St. Paul" educated a corps of men like unto himself, a congregation of pious and free men. What the Paulist, Father Hecker, has done for the congregation he claimed he had done voluntarily inspired by the Holy Spirit. Hecker rather tolerates a surplus of individual freedom than autocracy; individuality loses its right of existence if it encroaches upon the spirit and work of society. Poverty and obedience were not demanded by Hecker of his Paulists as a special virtue, but more did he demand as the first and last duty of the true Paulist father the zeal of his soul for apostolic works, by which he understood the work for the conversion of America. Hecker laid no stress upon the taking of vows: strong men need no vows; weak men under the coercion of the vow will probably reach a certain state of piety. This sort of piety, however, he says, is fruitless and is often for the individual and his society a burden. But is a congregation or society built upon such a

THE UNITED STATES

latter foundation a religious or even ecclesiastical order? Hecker replied, candidly: "We are not monks in the sense of Christian antiquity; our generation is not a generation of martyrs, hermits, or ascetics. Our contemporaries live in the market-place, the office, the factory, etc." He knew that there dwelled human society, and that is the place where holiness must reach them. Character grows stronger in its daily struggle with earthly difficulties and hindrances; after they are conquered they will lead the Church to perfection. Daily cares, labors, duties, responsibilities in daily life, are the pillars of holiness for the hermits of our time; only in this sense will Christian virtue ever be triumphant. This was Hecker's doctrine.

In 1875 Hecker published a valuable book on the condition of the Church, entitled "An Exposition of the Church in View of Recent Difficulties and Controversies, and the Present Need of the Age," published at London; the author's name, however, was not given. A twofold calamity will visit the earth: the Germanic races will reject Catholicism, while Christianity in Romanic races will decay.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

This calamity can only be prevented if both races with their special civilization and strength unite in the Church. Now, Romanic races lay the stress on externals and formalities; the Germanic practice subjectivity. Romanic races have crowned their work with the Vatican Council; a future struggle concerning authority in Catholicism is impossible. Therefore Germanic races are free to use their power in the deepening of the inner life of the Church, which means the release of personal individuality and activity. Since the sixteenth century the Catholic Church has always opposed with its autocratic principles the individualistic principles of Protestantism; Catholicism, says Hecker, has reaped wonderful fruits, like uniformity and discipline, and has also saved the truth, but it has lost its energy and weakened the natural powers and talents of humanity. The future of the races in the modern world depends upon their strength and vigilance, on the initiative and the sense of duty of the individual. The responsibility of the individual is on a much higher plane. The Church must take this fact in consideration, and conse-

THE UNITED STATES

quently subordinate passive virtues to active virtues. Here he means that the Church must do everything possible to enlarge the energy and self-confidence of man in the natural plane, so to make room in the spiritual life for the individual guidance of the soul by the Holy Spirit. Then Romanic formality will absorb Germanic subjectivity; Germanic deepness of spirit will be an ally to Romanic organization; the Church is saved, the world conquered, Christianity has accomplished its purpose.

In these historical and philosophical thoughts of Isaac T. Hecker the German Jesuit Otto Pfülf recognized simply the dreams of a weak mind, yet Hecker fought actually for religious profundity, for the moral power of a national Christianity. On the twenty-second day of December, 1888, Hecker died, with a strong faith in the victory of Catholicism. He had not realized how profoundly Protestant his heart remained; much less did he ever anticipate that his spirit—the spirit of a man who had joined Catholicism and had fought its battles and won its victories—would be branded as a

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

dangerous heretic and be excommunicated by the Church of Rome after his death.

In 1891 the Paulist Father W. Elliott published a book in New York on "The Life of Father Hecker" which was rather transcendental, but valuable in a religious-scientific sense. The introduction, written by Archbishop Ireland, added to its specific value. It has never been translated into the German; although in 1897 a French translation appeared, written by Abbé Felix Klein, professor at the Catholic Institute in Paris. Then began the history of "Americanism." The French clergy literally absorbed the book. Within a few weeks practically four editions had been sold. At that grave moment the French people faced the great fact—a fact which unfortunately in a certain sense has never left them—that conditions as they existed could not remain so. The clergy was in the hands of hierarchical absolutism, with no protection whatever, violently kept away from the influence of modern science, and Christianity, such as it was, had no influence upon the rank and file of the French people. Some individual priests had

THE UNITED STATES

then already voluntarily left the Roman Church, when Elliott-Klein's new book paved a way. If such a harmony has been possible in America to believe as a Catholic and think as a Modernist, why not in France? The Vatican had recognized the Paulists in their peculiarities; Archbishop Ireland was enthusiastic over Hecker's work. Mgr. O'Connell had declared with all certainty that Americanism would not be a menace to the belief and morals of the Catholic Church; it is no liberal or schismatic heresy. Felix Klein published the sixth edition of Hecker's biography, and to it he could add a letter of Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, dated April 14, 1898, wherein Gibbons expressed his delight that the apostolic mission of Father Hecker had now found recognition in Europe. Simultaneously the Jesuits exerted their special and always successful influence in referring here to tradition and scholasticism, and a lively literary battle ensued in France. The German Jesuit, Otto Pfülf, said, "Hecker is the product of Kantian subjectivism, of Methodistic mental disorder, of ingenuous presumption of modern Yan-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

keism;" "such a man, however pure and honorable his motives might be, should not be proclaimed as the leader of modern intellectual life, nor as a teacher and guide for the Catholic Church." In vain had some American dignitaries celebrated and congratulated him as the "Gem" of American clerics; in vain had Cardinal Gibbons given him this splendid testimony, "A providential agent for the spread of the Catholic faith, a faithful child of the Holy Church, every way Catholic and entirely orthodox." Traditions and scholasticism won the victory. January 22, 1899, Pope Leo XIII sent a papal letter across the Atlantic which contained the polite but firm stand of the Vatican concerning Americanism. It had not found favor at Rome, and was therefore condemned. Of course, very naturally, what always has happened in history happened here. Cardinal Gibbons's letter had another meaning; Archbishop Ireland quickly made a trip to Rome, and Felix Klein immediately ceased publishing his book. Other archbishops of the United States most politely thanked the pope for his explanation. Americanism found a

THE UNITED STATES

sequel in the “*Idealkatholizismus*” of Herman Schell in Germany. Both men shared the same fate after their death.

In a previous chapter mention has been made of the Old Catholic Church in Austria and Russian Poland. As this body has quite a number of adherents in the United States, so we must mention their work. The discontent over the Vatican decrees, so pronounced in Germany, for instance, was somewhat slower in taking organized form in the United States.

Josef René Villate, a priest of French Canadian ancestry, who has sustained various relations in connection with various Protestant societies for mission work among the foreign population in Wisconsin, had received the ordination from Bishop Herzog of the Swiss Christian Catholic Church, and also received episcopal consecration in 1892 from Archbishop Alvarez of India, Ceylon, and Goa. But the right of Alvarez to perform episcopal acts was under question, and the consecration of Villate was not recognized by the Old Catholic bishops of Europe or by the Protestant Episcopalian bishops in

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

the United States. Hence the attempts made by Villate to found an Old Catholic Church in the United States had no permanent result. More successful has been the work among the Polish immigrants to this country—people of this nationality coming here with a lively dissatisfaction with the course of the Roman Catholic Church in their own land. Many of them had no ecclesiastical relations at all, and a movement was begun by Anthony Koslowski, who died January 14, 1907; a Pole of Italian education, who became rector of a Polish congregation in Chicago in 1893. The next year he withdrew from the Roman Catholic communion and became a leader in the reform movement. He was elected a bishop, and received consecration from the Old Catholic Bishop of Switzerland at Berne, Switzerland, in 1897, founding then the Independent (Polish) Catholic Church. The growth of the organization was remarkable; congregations were established in Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Buffalo, Jersey City, Fall River, Mass., and Wilkesbarre, Pa. According to

THE UNITED STATES

the last edition (1910) of the "New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," probably the last available information, the organization numbered in 1902 twenty-two priests, ten sisters, twenty-six congregations, eighty thousand adherents, twenty-six schools with three thousand attendants, twenty-six Sunday-schools, and thirty-one buildings. It had, besides, an educational institution with grammar and high school and industrial departments in Chicago, and connected with it a hospital and dispensary and a home for the aged.

The Independent (Polish) Catholic Church made overtures in 1902 to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States for recognition and intercommunion on the basis of the Lambeth "Quadrilateral," but beyond referring the matter to a committee no definite action has been taken. In the overtures the object of the organization was stated as the wish to serve those who can not intelligently take part in worship conducted in the English tongue, and allegiance was pledged to the Old Catholic Synod of

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Europe until such time as the Church shall be received by the Protestant Episcopal Church as an affiliated body.

The disposition to separate from the Roman Catholic Church, illustrated by the formation of the Polish organization just described, manifested itself also among Bohemians and others of the Slavic race in America. A number of independent congregations nucleated in several cities. It was felt that these should be united under episcopal administration; and as the Independent (Polish) Catholic Church desired to restrict its work to Poles, a separate organization seemed necessary. The advice of the Old Catholic Bishops of Utrecht and Switzerland was asked, and in consequence of their advice, taking into account the largeness of the country and the possibility of three or four Old Catholic dioceses, the National Catholic Church was organized, with Jan F. Tichy as episcopal administrator (appointed by the Bishop of Utrecht). This Church is formed upon the same basis as the Mother Church in Switzerland, this including theoretical as well as practical matters. Its at-

THE UNITED STATES

titude is avowedly friendly toward the Polish organization and to the Protestant Episcopal Church. It derives its apostolic succession from the Church in Holland. It reported in 1906 nine churches and eleven missions in the United States and in Canada, seven priests, and about fifteen thousand members. It is incorporated in Ohio, and has a cathedral and other buildings in Cleveland, with property valued at about \$20,000. Bulletin 103 of the United States Census (Religious Bodies) gives the National Polish Church in America twenty-four priests, twenty-four ministers, 15,473 communicants, and church property valued at \$494,700. Dr. Peter Roberts reports in September, 1909, the Independent (Polish) Catholic Church as having ninety churches.

While reviewing the Polish question we must in this connection present another side of the American Catholic question. An article in the Milwaukee *Press (Prasa)*, after noting that in a competition among Polish pupils in writing reportorial articles, "all those whose work was below the required percentage were born and educated in this

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

country," while the successful competitors were educated in Europe, asks why this was so: "Why, then, are they such poor writers?" To its own query this paper then replies as follows:

"Because of the poor and faulty educational facilities. Being mostly orthodox Catholics, Polish parents are compelled to send their children to Polish parochial schools. All other schools, especially the public schools, are denounced from the pulpit and in the so-called Church press as un-Christian, pagan, and demoralizing institutions. Parents sending their children to any other but the parochial school are denounced, threatened, ostracized, even expelled from the Church, and their children are persecuted.

"With the exception of those where the priest himself is a sincere educator, the parochial schools are poor, many of them very poor, educational institutions. Reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and history are taught in many of them rather superficially. On the other hand many hours every day are spent reciting catechism and Church

THE UNITED STATES

formulas, which is called teaching religion, but it is far from being really religion.

“The result of such a poor system of teaching is that the Polish children, after spending six or seven years in the parochial school, can hardly pass an examination for the fifth grade in the public schools—if they want to continue their education in those schools.

“The rule in most of the parishes is that the child shall not leave the parochial school until after first communion; and no child is accepted to first communion until after being thirteen years of age. (Of course, this rule has lately been altered, and probably must be changed again in order to be adapted to certain circumstances.) It very often happens that a brighter child finishes all the grades in the parochial school at the end of its eleventh or twelfth year, but it is not allowed to leave the parochial school until it is over thirteen years of age. It is required to stay in the parochial school and waste one or two years doing nothing.

Now, a child being thirteen years of age and graduating only into the fifth or even

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

sixth grade has three or four more years to study in order to graduate from the public school. Therefore the child that attends a parochial school must study in the common school until it gets to be sixteen or seventeen, sometimes even eighteen years of age; while the child that attends the public school finishes the same studies when it is about fourteen years of age.

“In some parishes so-called ‘high schools’ are established for those who have graduated from the parochial school. Not much of importance is taught in these so-called ‘high schools,’ their main object being to keep the children away from the public school.”

Now, of the Polish population of America about fifty per cent belong to the working-man’s class, and Polish families are quite large. Therefore very few Polish parents can afford to send their children to school after the fourteenth year. The fault here lies not with the Polish people, but with the Church authorities, who by such queer means compel the people to keep their children in ignorance. The Polish people realize that more and more. They demand better paro-

THE UNITED STATES

chial schools, but it is said that their demands are ignored.

A much more pathetic side of this picture is the free-thought movement among the Bohemians. About fifteen or twenty per cent of the Bohemians in the United States belong to such "Free Thinking Societies." They were originally all Roman Catholics, but shook off the Roman yoke, and with it all religious affiliations, and organized their lodges, which in some degree represent congregations. They frequently carry on free-thought schools, where on Sunday mornings, Saturday afternoons, and at other leisure times the children can be trained in Bohemian grammar and history, and in the views of the free-thinkers. For this purpose a catechism has been written. There is also a profoundly pathetic little handbook of addresses, they can hardly be called services, for use at their funerals.

It is judged by some that this movement is rapidly losing momentum. It is difficult to keep the interest and enthusiasm of the young people. They find little to feed on in teachings so largely merely negative; noth-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

ing in their experience answers to their parents' rancor against the corrupt side of the priests, as they had seen it in Austria, and the ties of race and speech, which are so powerful a bond among the first generation, influence the later born much less. The free-thought movement is essentially religious, in spite of the crudity of its materialistic philosophy and of its propaganda in favor of atheism; it is the work of men, as scholars in the movement assert, men to whom questions of religious belief are the supremely important and the supremely interesting thing in life, and to whom intellectual sincerity and courage are the breath of their nostrils. The tone of the thought of these Bohemians at its best may be illustrated by the following quotation from a lecture on "Free Thought in America," by Anton Jurka: "Let us be strong. Let us firmly believe that we are maintaining the position which answers most loyally to the nobility of nature. Let us, according to our strength, draw from deeds both past and present, faith in a better future, and let us help to build this better future by faith, hope, and love;

THE UNITED STATES

by faith in the noble final goal of mankind; by hope that humanity will reach its goal, and will be thoroughly imbued with a culture and enlightenment not yet dreamed of by us; with a love pure, self-sacrificing to nature, to man, to humanity as a whole."

Now that the critical and destructive work is done, there seems to be a great deal of mere indifference to all religious matters, and, as one hears, a good deal of self-indulgent, rather gross living on the part of some who are "free-thinkers as much as they are anything." On the other hand, one also hears of the children of the old fighters for free thought joining one or another of the Protestant Churches, partly perhaps from social reasons, partly, doubtless, from a hunger which negations could not satisfy. One instance is reported that the free-thinkers, as such, have affiliated themselves with Unitarianism.

But we must consider another phase of Roman Catholic Church life in the United States in order to form a clear opinion of the situation. In our country there is no obstacle in the way of Catholics leaving the

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

Roman Church when, in the development of thought, they outgrow its dogmas and find many practiced superstitions degrading. As Catholics in European countries are rejecting Romanism and Vaticanism, that is the despotic rule of the Curia, the rule of the Jesuits—and the whole world knows what Jesuitism signifies—so in this country many of the best element of the Catholic people are leaving the Roman Church. In February, 1911, some Irish nuns arrived in New York City on their way to Oregon, with a doleful complaint that they had been expelled from Portugal last October, with all other members of the religious orders. They said it was the work of the mob. But this mob was composed exclusively of Portuguese Catholics who had been reared in the precepts of Roman Catholicism and never knew Protestant missionaries, but who had also been oppressed, swindled, and kept in a state of degradation and ignorance by their bishops, priests, monks, and nuns. Catholics in the United States will probably not follow the example of the Portuguese, the French, and the Italians, and take effective measures to

THE UNITED STATES

express their indignation at the rule of the Vatican, which is the same for all peoples who submit to it. But human nature is the same in all countries, and outraged humanity will assert itself. In the meantime many self-respecting Catholics are becoming like other Americans and are uniting with the various Protestant Churches. The fact is well known by Catholic authorities, and the evidence is multiplying every day. On January 15, 1911, at a great meeting of the Allegheny County Federation of Catholic Societies in St. Mary's Lyceum, Mt. Washington, Pittsburgh, the Rev. Thomas F. Coakly, the secretary of Bishop J. F. Regis Canevin, of the Pittsburgh Diocese, declared that, "while the Roman Catholic Church has made enormous gains in the United States, the losses have been no less enormous. The Catholic population ten years ago was eleven millions, while to-day it is about fifteen millions." Despite these gains he said that during the last ten years 5,500,000 came to this country from Europe, and that Catholic statistics do not show the increase that should be represented by these figures in immigrat-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tion, not speaking of the natural increase within the own ranks of the Catholic Church in the United States outside of immigration. Hundreds of thousands have been lost to the Catholic Church through the active propaganda waged by the disciples of Socialism and by the inroads made by infidelity and irreligion. If the United States of America to-day numbers only about 33,000,000 of adherents to the different denominations, while its population is about 90,000,000, and while many close observers estimate that Roman Catholicism alone should number at least about 30,000,000 souls in this country, taking the vast natural increase and the enormous number of Catholic immigrants who came to our shores in consideration, somewhere in this great land of ours there must be millions of Catholics who are no longer loyal to the prisoner of the Vatican or who have become entirely irreligious. By no means do all of them belong to the Protestant Church.

We must again, in this connection, quote Rev. Thomas F. Coakly, when he says: "Truly this is one of the saddest pages in the history of the Catholic Church in America.

THE UNITED STATES

To-day we have in round numbers 15,000,000 Catholics in the United States. Had we held fast to those who came to our shores, we should have at least 40,000,000; for the leakage has been well-nigh startling. Everywhere throughout the length and breadth of this great land we meet persons bearing ancient and venerable Catholic names who are now lined up against Christ and His Church."

This priest concluded his sorrowful lament by declaring the Catholic education alone can save these immigrants to the Church. But as they had Catholic education in the countries where they came from, the outlook for the Church is not very hopeful in educating them. Noted Catholics in the United States are doubtless mistaken in saying that the Catholics who leave the Roman Church have turned against Christ. Certainly not all of them, for such a condition would be a sad day for the United States. Many of them are uniting with the various Protestant Churches, where Christ is preached as the Son of God. It is conceded by men of knowledge that the statement is

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

generally true that former Catholics can be found in all Evangelical Churches. They may not announce their conversion from the Roman faith in season and out of season, and perhaps never again have referred to it.

In October, 1898, Thomas J. Morgan, corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, New York City, who had been Indian commissioner at Washington for four years during the administration of President Benjamin Harrison, sent a letter to thirty-one Baptist pastors in different parts of the country. General Morgan stated publicly that there are few Baptist churches in the country which do not include in their membership converted Catholics. This statement had been sharply controverted by the Roman hierarchy. So in order that some good might be accomplished by publishing some facts—not in a spirit of controversy, but to afford the public information—he asked in his letter to the Baptist pastors the following questions: 1. Name and location of your church. 2. Number of members. 3. Number formerly members of the Roman Catholic Church. 4. Name of one or

THE UNITED STATES

more converted Roman Catholics of your acquaintance who are persons of intelligence and position, specifying what place they hold, indicating whether any of them are Church officers or not. General Morgan, who had been distinguished in the army during the Civil War as the "Christian Soldier," received the following replies: Twenty-nine of these pastors replied that they had 313 converted Catholics, varying from two to forty, in their congregations, and many of them were prominent in Church, business, and professional life. The subject was discussed in the religious press at the time, and much interest was manifested. The New York correspondent of the *Boston Congregationalist*, November 10, 1898, said in that influential paper:

"These twenty-nine Churches are all American. They are in Boston, Providence, Lowell, New Haven, New York, St. Paul, Detroit, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and many other cities. It is also shown by General Morgan that the society of which he is secretary has mission congregations of Poles, French, Bohemians, and Italians, made up

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

wholly of former Catholics, while of the 25,000 German Baptists fully one-fourth came out of the Roman Communion. At the same time that General Morgan began his investigation another member of a mission board in this city began inquiries among pastors to know if they had any former Roman Catholics in their Church membership. They included Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Moravians, Methodists, and Episcopalians. Without exception these forty-seven pastors replied in the affirmative, and gave numbers from one to seventy each. Speaking of it, General Morgan says: 'We ought not to be surprised at these revelations, even if we did not know that such changes are going on. The dominant characteristic of American life is religious freedom.' "

We will further refer to the small body of Reformed Catholics which originated in New York City about 1879. Priests of the Roman Catholic Church who had left that communion formed a few congregations, chiefly in New York, and began evangelistic work on a Protestant basis and belief. The leader of the movement was Rev. James A.

THE UNITED STATES

O'Connor, recently deceased, who was editor of *The Converted Catholic*, of New York City, which protested against features of the Roman system of doctrine, government, discipline, and practice, and taught Protestant doctrine as understood by the Evangelical Churches. Opposition to the sacramental system of the Roman Catholic Church is a pronounced feature of the Reformed Catholics. The salvation of the believer is not dependent on his relation to the Church, but comes directly from Christ. Hence there is no need of intermediaries or other mediators. All can come directly to God by faith in Christ, the only High Priest. The Holy Spirit is the only teaching power in the Church. There are six churches, eight ministers, and about two thousand communicants. Rev. James O'Connor said: "I have helped one hundred and sixty priests and thousands of the laity, and I know that there is not a Protestant Church in New York but has converted Catholics among its members, and many of them persons of prominence. It is the same in other cities, and even in the small towns, as Mr. Camp says. (Mr. Camp

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

is one of the foremost journalists in New York, a leading member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who has filled many offices in that body. For twelve years he had been in search of a Church in New York that had not in its membership former Roman Catholics, and had not found one. Nor has he found any in other cities. He also stated, under February 16, 1911, that at one time last year Bishop Greer had fifteen applications from Roman Catholic priests to be received into the Protestant Episcopal Church.) The first large sum of money I received for the work of Christ's Mission—which, you know, is specially devoted to the conversion of Roman Catholics—was a legacy from a converted Catholic, a member of the late Dr. John Hall's church. I have preached, when invited, in many churches of all denominations during the last thirty-two years, and every time I have found converted Catholics. In some cases the pastor, who had not been long in charge of that particular church, did not know that his parishioners who greeted me so warmly had been Roman Catholics before they were received into membership.

THE UNITED STATES

The emigrants from foreign Catholic countries come to our shores; they have their minds enlightened and developed in our public schools; the hearts of many are opened to the love of God by the power of the Holy Spirit through the Bible; they consequently become like other Christians in our great Republic, and like other citizens who have made this country what it is. A great many of them have been kept in ignorance and degradation by the Church of Rome in Italy, Austria, and other countries. In this land of freedom, where spiritual liberty is the birthright of every citizen, the chains of spiritual slavery are broken. All powers of Rome and all powers of the world can not stop the march of events that God has set in motion in this country. It is well known that the first immigrants to North America were largely from Protestant countries, the Dutch, the English, the Irish Presbyterians, and the Germans. They laid the foundation on which our Nation is built. But for the last sixty years the Catholic countries have supplied the greater part of our immigrants. Ireland was the first to send forth a stream of hu-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

manity that seemed to overwhelm the institutions of the country. The emigrants from that poor, distressed country—the most faithful to the pope—came by the hundreds of thousands every year. Then the German-speaking Catholics, the Hungarians, the French Canadians, the Poles, and the Italians. It has been estimated that if the emigrants from Catholic countries and their descendants for the last sixty years had continued faithful subjects of the Roman pontiff, one-half of the population of this country would be Roman Catholics;—Priest Coakly, whom we have quoted above, says forty million; Bishop McFaul, of Trenton, N. J., has declared that twenty-five million Catholics have been lost to the Roman Church in the United States. Every Christian in America must give thanks to Almighty God that many of them are found in Protestant denominations and are enjoying a greater spiritual liberty than in some of the European Catholic countries, while it is greatly to be regretted that so many of them are without any Church affiliation whatever.

Of course, in many quarters there is a

THE UNITED STATES

sort of impatience with any attempt at evangelizing the Romanism that is at our door. This is one of the peculiarities of the American religious mind. The average Protestant says: "Let the Romanists alone." "If he is a good Catholic, what more can we ask?" This is the attitude not of what might be termed the ignorant, but very often of those who are among the most enlightened, even the clergy in many instances sharing in this opinion. The result is that the work carried on among the Catholics in the United States lacks those generous proportions which it ought to have. Be it admitted, not in the spirit of bigotry, nor with the narrowness of vision that sees no good in Roman Catholicism, that that phase of Christianity has certainly many traits that are admirable, many sons and daughters who are truly devout; but one must not be blinded by that fact to the real facts in the case—the fruits of the vine. We as Americans can ill afford to have our American civilization tainted by that peculiar form of corrupted Christianity which has given to the world such degenerate nations as the so-called Catholic countries.

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

It is often said that the Roman Catholicism that is here in the United States is not the same as that which we find elsewhere. While it is all very true that, in its minor phases, Catholicism changes, chameleon-like, according to the country where it breeds, it is equally true that in its chief characteristics it is ever the same. This is the boast of its popes and of its leading minds; this is the testimony of keen observers who have traveled. Roman Catholicism produces Spain, Italy, and South America.

Dr. E. C. E. Dorion, associate editor of the *Zion's Herald*, writes: "It is erroneous also to believe that, because of the strength of Protestantism here, another condition of things must result. In certain quarters it is claimed that, even as a healthy body can slough off diseases, so can the American body politic throw off all the impurities that may come to it. Up to a certain point this may be true, but there is such a thing as a healthy body breaking down after a while—it can stand so much and no more. Canada is under British rule, but all of the British power

THE UNITED STATES

can not prevent the priest-ridden condition of the Province of Quebec. True, the case is not entirely parallel, but it serves as an illustration of what Romanism can do where it has the upper hand, even when the government is Protestant."

Not every Protestant realizes what Roman Catholicism—and we place the emphasis most emphatically on Roman, as it is the foreign influence against which we must be on guard—means at home in the United States. Some Protestants call it the only true Church; others are coveting many of her features; her own leaders are continually crying for more and more "rights," and are generally getting them. Is not the present position of the Roman Church one that demands attention? Through the portals of immigration the number of Catholics is constantly increasing. They are accompanied by their own priests and teachers, those who are to see that they remain, first of all, loyal unto their Church and her traditions. The Church Extension Society of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, organized Oc-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tober 18, 1905, is conducted with truly American vigor. It began in a very humble way, but, nevertheless, with great intelligence.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward the United States was plainly shown recently in an address delivered at the ninth annual convention of the Federation of Catholic Societies of Louisiana, held in New Orleans, Sunday and Monday, April 23-24, 1911, by Hon. James J. McLoughlin, as reported by the *New World*, May 6, 1911. He said: "Catholicism is going to be—if it is not already—the religion of the United States. The Catholic Church in her organization, in her principles of government, in her methods of choosing those who are to rule over her, is essentially democratic. Her priests spring from all ranks; her bishops, her cardinals, her popes, are chosen in a mode singularly democratic. (????) Therefore it is easy, it is natural, for an American to be a Catholic. Consequently the work of the Church Extension Society here simply means that the dogmas and doctrines of the Catholic Church have to be placed in intelligent form before the American people in order to convince

THE UNITED STATES

them that ours is the true faith. All over the United States, in the mountains of North Carolina, on the great plains of the West, in the valleys of the Mississippi, are living the descendants of Catholic settlers who came to this country from Ireland and Germany and other parts of Catholic Europe. They went into the new lands, far from civilization. There were no priests; there were no churches. The old folks were faithful while they lived. Their children found no means to continue the practice of their religion. The Protestant meeting-house, mixed marriages, the sociability of the non-Catholic organizations, and, above all, the absolute impossibility of obtaining priests to minister to these scattered Catholics, completed the work of separation, and to-day probably one-half of the God-fearing native American members of the non-Catholic Christian Churches are the children or grandchildren of Catholic parents, whom it is our duty to bring back into their old home. The society is officered and guided by American men with American brains. We are using American methods, and in the scattered and disorganized condi-

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

tion of many of the non-Catholic sects it is not difficult for the compact, well-disciplined forces of the Catholic Church Extension Society to obtain the victory when the cause of faith is fought out fairly and squarely before the American people."

No thinking man, knowing the principles of Catholicism and Protestantism, will ever assume with Hon. James J. McLoughlin that members of Protestant Churches whose parents or grandparents had been Roman Catholics will return to the Roman fold. Roman Catholic America may be a long distance in the future, but the Roman Catholic Church in America is here, and in some parts of the country it can only be a short time before her presence must cause trouble to the established principles of American civilization. Often the patriotism of Catholics in the time of war is quoted, also isolated cases of Catholic Americanism are repeatedly referred to; yet the real fact remains, Roman Catholicism, as it is guided by the Vatican and its Italian and other advisers, who are not at all familiar with all conditions in this and other

THE UNITED STATES

countries, this Roman Catholicism is not in harmony with that genius of civilization which makes America what it is to-day. We rejoice in the sons of the Church of Rome who are or have been faithful to the flag and that for which it stands: in a Bonaparte as a cabinet officer, a Sherman in war, a Chief Justice White; but these men and the Church of Rome, which is bound to exert her foreign influence over our free American institutions, are two, and every intelligent and unbiased man knows this to be a fact. It is always the corrupted form of Christianity in Latin Catholic countries of which we as Americans know so much and of which we are likewise afraid.

The work of reaching Roman Catholics in America for Protestantism is not a work that will mean bitter strife and haughtiness of methods, but a straight-forward, honest effort to reach our brothers who are in error. Evangelical Churches have a right to do this. Roman Catholics themselves do not hesitate to send through the country some of their most eloquent and thoughtful preachers to persuade men to their faith. These men are

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

heard respectfully; they are unmolested. In the same spirit should the work among them by Protestants be received.

It must be stated to the honor of various Protestant missions in the larger cities in the United States that they can not be otherwise but successful, as Catholics are taking special notice of them. Such missions should be found everywhere in Catholic centers, and Protestantism in all of its purity, with its emphasis upon true Christianity, should be promulgated. We take the city of St. Louis for instance. According to the *Catholic Citizen*, February 11, 1911, the Catholic pastors of St. Louis issued a signed circular which is significant of an awakening of the Catholic conscience to the duty of bringing religion to the "un-churched." This circular stated that a large number of Catholics from foreign countries (Hungarians, Lithuanians, Syrians, Macedonians, Italians) have settled in certain districts in St. Louis within the last few years. Nearly all of these were poor working people, many of them barely able to live. Lacking priests of their own nationalities to look after them, and not used to Amer-

THE UNITED STATES

ican customs, they have not become identified with any of the Catholic parishes, though the priests had tried in various ways to attract them. Meantime the clergy could not help being astonished at the activity of "our separated brethren" among these poor Catholics. Five different establishments, known as "Mission Settlements," had been planted in a certain territory, and with large sums of money at their command and large forces of men and women working with a zeal "that would be admirable in another cause," these missions "have become great centers of activity for leading our people away from the faith of their fathers." These Catholic priests admit that the missions used various means to attract the people and win their good will. Day nurseries, kindergartens, boys' clubs, gymnasiums, moving picture shows, illustrated lectures, baths, lunch clubs, playgrounds, music classes, brass bands, parlor and reading-rooms; through these and similar attractions these foreign Catholic people were brought together, and then it was easy to get them to attend the religious services. One of these Sunday schools had 595

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

children in attendance during the month of January, 1911. A large percentage of these, perhaps one-half, were Catholics. These mission establishments have made alarming inroads among the Catholic poor, not only of the above named nationalities, but among the children of the parishes of which these complaining priests were pastors. The knowledge of such facts has come so convincingly before the Catholic clergy that they had reasons to be alarmed, and consequently they were earnestly studying to offset the efforts which they considered an evil.

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States shows great activity in her "Catholic Colonization Plan," which is very comprehensive in its scope. This plan seems to be considered a practical solution of many of the questions of Catholic Immigration. Catholic colonies are to be formed to bring together Catholics who otherwise would be scattered among Protestants or, as the Roman hierarchy terms it, "unbelievers." So they intend to reach the industrial laborer, the day laborer, the farmer, the business man, and finally the non-Catholic.

THE UNITED STATES

How about Roman Catholicism and the free institutions in the United States? We must briefly consider the attitude of the Roman Catholic hierarchy toward some of the essential elements of a free government, mentioning the public school system, which is the principal civil pillar of our Government. It is the bulwark of American liberty and the hope of the future greatness and glory of our Nation. The doctrinal position of the Roman Catholic Church denies the right of the State to educate the young and makes this exclusively the function of the parent and the Church, asserting that history emphatically teaches that to leave the matter of education to parents means leaving it to the Church of the parents, and that, especially in Catholic countries, the Church invariably steps in and assumes the parents' alleged prerogative in the matter. The State can not, without recreancy to its paramount duty, yield its right and function of education either to the parent or to the Church. American citizens know very well that in the countries where the Roman Catholic position with regard to education has obtained the people

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

are buried in illiteracy—as we have shown above in the case of Portugal—superstition is rife, and bigotry abounds. The greater the power of the Church, the less the quantity and quality of secular instruction.

One argument has repeatedly been applied by the Roman hierarchy in regard to our public school system: it has been brought into contempt by abusing and denouncing it as irreligious and promotive of immorality. All through the country, wherever Roman Catholic leaders think it wise to do so, plausible propositions or movements to secure the control of the teaching force are being made. Naturally they feel bitterly the heavy expenses which they have to bear to maintain their separate schools; while those who have taxable property, in addition to what goes to the Church schools, are obliged to pay their school taxes for the support of the State public schools. Catholic leaders know very well how strongly entrenched the public school system is, and they further know, indeed, that by attacking it definitely its foundation would only be more securely riveted. Yet repeatedly the tax question is brought

THE UNITED STATES

into the limelight. This could be seen in the formal letter by Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee, which was read in all the churches of the archdiocese of Milwaukee, wherein he opposed the free text-book bills in the Wisconsin Legislature. Of course, as a Catholic prelate he was naturally opposed to the American public school, and most emphatically he appealed to the Catholic taxpayers, saying that, according to the statistics published by the commissioner of education at Washington, D. C., the average annual expense for each child in the public schools of our Western States amounts to \$34.46. He says: "At this figure we Catholics, by supporting our own schools, save the State of Wisconsin an annual expense of not less than \$2,311,000."

The public school system is further brought into contempt by securing for the Roman Catholic parochial schools the largest possible share of the public school tax funds wherever this is possible. Thereby other denominations are encouraged to start sectarian schools and to demand public moneys in payment for the secular instruction given

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

therein. Consequently Catholic majorities on the public school boards are secured, also on the teaching staff of the public schools. In many instances the public school system has been brought into disfavor by securing the employment of monks and nuns as public school teachers, thus preventing normal school training of public school teachers. Jeremiah J. Crowley, a former priest and author of the famous book, "The Parochial School a Curse to the Church and a Menace to the Nation," presents many quotations from Roman Catholic sources in illustration and confirmation of many of the above mentioned phases. He states that in many conversations which he had had with members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country during the past twenty-five years with reference to public and parochial school, the ecclesiastical champions of the latter had expressed confidence that the insistent demands of the hierarchy for a division of the public school money would eventually be granted; that the American people would grow weary of the school contention and, to escape it, would adopt the Catholic view; that then

THE UNITED STATES

every effort would be made to secure the largest possible grants of public money; that the other sects would, out of envy, demand similar grants for their schools, and that they would be encouraged by Catholic dignitaries to press their claims; that the consequence would be the disruption of the public school system by the competition and antagonism of such sectarian bodies, and that the ultimate result would be the supremacy of the Catholic Church in education by virtue of her strong organization and her various orders.

Much has been made, by the public press even, of the amount that is saved the State by the parochial school system, and immediately the leaders of Catholics demand that the system, in so far as it relates to them, be extended. Of course, it would educate Roman Catholics. But the public school system of the United States produces Americans.

Romanism is now largely in control of the large cities of America, and if the State should agree to pay for the secular instruction of children in parochial schools in these cities it would be Catholic officials, prelates,

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

priests, and politicians who would fix and control the compensation and disbursement of the funds, for in such cities Catholics would form the majorities of the various committees and boards.

The masses of the Catholic people of the United States prefer the public school, and men familiar with the conditions within the Catholic Church declare as their profound conviction that they are morally certain that not five per cent of the Catholic laymen of America indorse at heart the parochial school. While they may send their children to these schools, and may be induced to pass resolutions of approval of them in their conventions, Jeremiah J. Crowley declared that if a perfectly free ballot could be cast by the Catholic laymen of America for perpetuity or suppression of the parochial school, it would be suppressed by an astounding majority; and that, "if it were a mere matter of blood, not one per cent of them would be found outside the ranks of the defenders of the American public school." It is said that priests and prelates work upon the fears and feelings of the women and children; so the fathers,

THE UNITED STATES

to have peace in their families, and to avoid open rupture with the parish priest, yield and send their children to the parochial school, though knowing that the public school—whatever may be said, and much of it justly, against it as a moral and religious educator—is vastly superior in its methods, equipment, and pedagogic talent, and prepares their children, as no other school can, for the keen struggle of American life and the stern duties of American citizenship.

America must likewise protect her freedom of conscience, speech, and press, and these are inseparably bound up with a free school. The liberty to think, speak, and print whatever one wishes, that is not, of course, libelous, makes possible a conflict of opinions, and such a contest is essential in the realm of ideas if progress is to be made. Freedom of the press will never be abolished in America while the people understand the difference between despotism and liberty, stagnation and progress. And why should the Catholic be so much afraid of it? The keen observer is convinced that a vast amount of favorable news to the Catholic Church finds

MODERNISM AND THE VATICAN

its way into the public press, and a vast amount of unfavorable news finds its way into waste-baskets. The American Roman Catholic hierarchy has left no stone unturned in its persistent efforts to control the utterances of the newspapers of the land about the Catholic Church, her aims, her work, and her priests.

The American people with their splendid heritage of free institutions should set themselves as a wall of granite against even the shadow of sectarian interference with the bulwark of their liberties, the public school, and the freedom of speech, conscience, and the press.

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

324

16405

BX
1396
L6

Loeppert, Adam John, 1873-

Modernism and the Vatican, by Adam J. Loeppert
with an introduction by Bishop William F. McDowell
Cincinnati, Jennings and Graham; New York, E.
Mains, 1912,

324 p. 194-.

1. Modernism—Catholic church.

1. Title.

Library of Congress

BX1396.L6

CCS

A 6405

